Mary Elliotts Book
28th of 8th mo 1870

A PORTRAITURE

OF

QUAKERISM,

TAKEN FROM

A VIEW OF THE MORAL EDUCATION, DISCIPLINE, PECULIAR CUSTOMS, RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLES, POLITICAL AND CIVIL ECONOMY, AND CHARACTER,

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

BY THOMAS CLARKSON, M. A.,
AUTHOR OF SEVERAL ESSAYS ON THE SUBJECT OF THE SLAVE TRADE.

IN ONE VOLUMME.

INDIANAPOLIS:
PUBLISHED BY MERRILL & FIELD,
FOR THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS OF WESTERN YEARLY MEETING.
1870.

INTRODUCTION.

Motives for the undertaking—Origin of the name of Quakers—George Fox the founder of the Society—Short history of his life.

From the year 1787, when I began to devote my labors to the abolition of the Slave-trade, I was thrown frequently into the company of the people called Quakers. These people had been then long unanimous upon this subject. Indeed, they had placed it among the articles of their religious discipline. Their houses were of course open to me in all parts of the kingdom. Hence I came to a knowledge of their living manners, which no other person, who was not a Quaker, could have easily obtained.

As soon as I became possessed of this knowledge, or at least of so much of it as to feel that it was considerable, I conceived a desire of writing their moral history. I believed that I should be able to exhibit to the rest of the world many excellent customs, of which they were ignorant, but which it might be useful to them to know. I believed. too, that I should be affording to the Quakers themselves some lessons of utility, by letting them see, as it were in a glass, the reflection of their own images. I felt also a great desire, amidst these considerations, to do them justice; for ignorance and prejudice had invented many expressions concerning them, to the detriment of their character, which their conduct never gave me reason to suppose, during all my intercourse with them, to be true.

Nor was I without the belief that such a history might afford entertainment to many. The Quakers, as every body knows, differ, more than even many foreigners do, from their own countrymen. They adopt a singular mode of language. Their domestic customs are peculiar. They have renounced religious ceremonies, which all other Christians, in some form or other, have retained. They are distinguished from all the other islanders by their dress. These differences are great and striking; and I thought, therefore, that they, who were curious in the development of character, might be gratified in knowing the principles, which produced such numerous exceptions from the general practices of the world.

But though I had conceived from the operation of these sentiments upon my mind, as long ago as I have stated, a strong desire to write the moral history of the Quakers, yet my incessant occupations on the subject of the Slave-trade, and indisposition of body afterward, in consequence of the great mental exertions necessary in such a cause, prevented me from attempting to execute my design. At length these causes of prevention ceased. But when, after this, the subject recurred, I did not seem to have the industry and perseverance, though I had

still the inclination left, for the undertaking. Time, however, continued to steal on, till at length I began to be apprehensive, but more particularly within the last two years, that, if I were to delay my work much longer, I might not live to begin it at all. This consideration operated upon me. But I was forcibly struck by another; namely, that, if I were not to put my hand to the task, the Quakers would probably continue to be as little known to their fellow-citizens as they are at present. For I did not see who was to give a full and satisfactory account of them. It is true, indeed, that there are works, written by Quakers, from which a certain portion of their history, and an abstract of their religious principles, might be collected; but none from whence their living manners could be taken. It is true, also, that others, of other religious denominations, have written concerning them; but of those authors, who have mentioned them in the course of their respective writings, not one, to my knowledge, has given a correct account of them. It would be tedious to dwell on the errors of Mosheim, or of Formey, or of Hume, or on those to be found in many of the modern periodical publications*. It seemed, therefore, from the circumstance of my familiar intercourse with the Quakers, that it devolved upon me particularly to write their history. And I was the more confirmed in my opinion, because, in looking forward, I was not able to foresee the time when any other cause would, equally with that of the Slave-trade, bring any other person, who was not of the Society, into such habits of friendship with them, as that he should obtain an equal degree of knowledge concerning them with myself. By this new consideration I was more than ordinarily stimulated; and I began my work.

It is not improbable that some readers may imagine, from the account already given, that this work will be a partial one; or that it will lean, more than it ought to do, in favor of the Quakers. I do not pretend to say, that I shall be utterly able to divest myself of all undue influence, which their attention towards me may have produced; or that I shall be utterly unbiassed when I consider them as fellow-laborers in the work of the abolition of the Slave-trade; for, if others had put their shoulders to the wheel equally with them on the occasion, one of the greatest causes of human misery and moral evil, that was ever known in the world, had been long ago annihilated. Nor can I conceal that I have a regard for men, of whom it is a just feature in their character, that, whenever they can be brought to argue upon political subjects, they reason upon principle and not upon consequences; for if this mode of reasoning had been adopted by others, but particularly by men in exalted stations, policy had given way to moral justice, and there had been but little public wickedness in the world. But though I am confessedly partial to the Quakers on account of their hospitality to me, and on account of the good traits in their moral character, I am not so much so as to be blind to their imperfections. Quakerism is of itself a pure system; and, if followed closely, will lead towards purity and perfection: but I know well that all, who profess it, are not Quakers. The deviation, therefore, of their practice from their profession, and their frailties and imperfections, I shall uniformly lay open to them wherever I believe them to exist. And this I shall do, not because I wish to avoid the charge of partiality, but from a belief that it is my duty to do it.

---

* I must except Dr. Toulmin's candid Revision of Neal's History of the Puritans. One or two publications have appeared since, written in a liberal spirit; but they are confined principally to the religious principles of the Quakers.

The Society of which I am to speak, are called Quakers* by the world, but are known to each other by the name of Friends,—a beautiful appellation, and characteristic of the relation which man, under the Christian dispensation, ought uniformly to bear to man.

The founder of the Society was George Fox. He was born of "honest and sufficient parents," at Drayton in Leicestershire, in the year 1624. He was put out when young, according to his own account, to a man who was "a shoemaker by trade, and who dealt in wool, and followed grazing, and sold cattle." But it appears from William Penn, who became a member of the Society, and was acquainted with him, that he principally followed the country part of his master's business. He took a great delight in sheep; "an employment," says Penn, "that very well suited his mind in some respects, both for its innocency and its solitude, and was a just figure of his after-ministry and service."

In his youth he manifested a seriousness of spirit not usual in persons of his age. This seriousness grew upon him, and as it increased he encouraged it; so that in the year 1643, or in the twentieth year of his age, he conceived himself, in consequence of the awful impressions he had received, to be called upon to separate himself from the world, and to devote himself to religion. Before this time the Church of England, as a protestant church, had been established; and many who were not satisfied with the settlement of it, had formed themselves into different religious sects. There was a great number of persons also in the kingdom, who, approving neither of the religion of the establishment nor of that of the different denominations alluded to, withdrew from the communion of every visible church. These were ready to follow any teacher, who might inculcate doctrines that coincided with their own apprehensions. Thus far a way lay open among many for a cordial reception of George Fox. But of those, who had formed different visible churches of their own, it may be observed, that, though they were prejudiced, the Reformation had not taken place so long but that they were still alive to religious advancement. Nor had it taken place so long but that thousands were still very ignorant, and stood in need of light and information on that subject.

It does not appear, however, that George Fox, for the first three years from the time he conceived it to be his duty to withdraw from the world, did any thing as a public minister of the Gospel. He travelled, from the year 1643 to 1646, through the counties of Warwick, Leicester, Northampton, and Bedford, and as far as London. In this interval he appears to have given himself up to solemn impressions, and to have endeavored to find out as many serious people as he could, with a view of conversing with them on the subject of religion.

In 1647 he extended his travels to Derbyshire, and from thence into Lancashire, but returned to his native county. He met with many friendly people in the course of his journey, and had many and serious conversations with them; but he never joined in profession with any. At Duckenfield, however, and at Manchester, he went among those whom he termed "the Professors of Religion," and, according to his own expression, "he staid awhile, and declared Truth among them." Of these some were convinced, but others were enraged, being startled at his doctrine of Perfection. At Broughton, in Leicestershire, we find

---

*Justice Bennet, of Derby, gave the Society the name of Quakers in the year 1650, because the founder of it admonished him, and those present with him, to *tremble* at the word of the Lord.

him attending a meeting of the Baptists, at which many of other denominations were present. Here he spoke publicly, and convinced many. After this he went back to the county of Nottingham: and here, a report having gone abroad that he was an extraordinary young man, many, both priests and people, came far and near to see him.

In 1648 he confined his movements to a few counties. In this year we find him becoming a public character. In Nottinghamshire he delivered himself in public at three different meetings, consisting either of priests and professors, as he calls them, or of professors and people. In Warwickshire he met with a great company of professors, who were praying, and expounding the Scriptures, in the fields. Here he discoursed largely, and the hearers fell into contention, and so parted. In Leicestershire he attended another meeting, consisting of Churchpeople, Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, where he spoke publicly again. This meeting was held in a church. The persons present discoursed and reasoned. Questions were propounded, and answers followed. An answer given by George Fox, in which he stated that the Church was the pillar and ground of Truth, and that it did not consist of a mixed multitude, or of an old house made up of lime, stones, and wood, but of living stones, living members, and a spiritual household, of which Christ was the head, set them all on fire. The clergyman left the pulpit, the people their pews, and the meeting separated. George Fox, however, went afterwards to an inn, where he argued with priests and professors of all sorts. Departing from thence, he took up his abode for some time in the vale of Beevor, where he preached Repentance, and convinced many. He then returned into Nottinghamshire, and passed from thence into Derbyshire, in both of which counties his doctrines spread. And after this, warning justices of the peace as he travelled along, to do justice, and notoriously wicked men to amend their lives, he came into the vale of Beevor again. In this vale it was that he received, according to his own account, his commission from Divine Authority, by means of impressions on his mind; in consequence of which he conceived it to be discovered to him, among other things, that he was to "turn the people from darkness to the light." By this time he had converted many hundreds to his opinions, and "divers meetings of Friends," to use his own expressions, "had been then gathered."

The year 1649 was ushered in by new labors. He was employed occasionally in writing to judges and justices to do justice, and in warning persons to fulfil the duties of their respective stations in life.

This year was the first of all his years of suffering. For it happened on a Sunday morning, that, coming in sight of the town of Nottingham, and seeing the great church, he felt an impression on his mind to go there. On hearing a part of the sermon, he was so struck with what he supposed to be the erroneous doctrine it contained, that he could not help publicly contradicting it. For this interruption of the service he was seized, and afterwards confined in prison. At Mansfield, again, as he was declaring his own religious opinions in the church, the people fell upon him, and beat and bruised him, and put him afterwards in the stocks. At Market-Bosworth he was stoned, and driven out of the place. At Chesterfield he addressed both the clergyman and the people; but they carried him before the mayor, who detained him till late at night, at which unseasonable time the officers and watchmen put him out of the town.

I would here observe, before I proceed to the occurrences of another year, that there is reason to believe that George Fox disapproved of his own conduct

in having interrupted the service of the church at Nottingham, which I have stated to be have been the first occasion of his imprisonment. For if he believed any one of his actions, with which the world had been offended, to have been right, he repeated it, as circumstances called it forth, though he was sure of suffering for it either from the magistrates or the people. He, however, never repeated this, but always afterwards, when any occasion of religious controversy occurred in any of the churches where his travels lay, uniformly suspended his observations till the service was over*.

George Fox spent almost the whole of the next year, that is, of the year 1650, in confinement in Derby prison.

In 1651, when he was set at liberty, he seems not to have been in the least disheartened by the treatment he had received there, or at the different places before mentioned; but to have resumed his travels, and to have held religious meetings as he went along. He had even the boldness to go into Litchfield, because he imagined it to be his duty, and, with his shoes off, to pronounce with an audible voice in the streets, and this on the market-day, a woe against that city. He continued also to visit the churches, as he journeyed, in the time of divine service, and to address the priests and the people publicly, as he saw occasion; but not, as I observed before, till he believed the service to be over. It does not appear, however, that he suffered any interruption upon these occasions in the course of the present year, except at York-Minster; where, as he was beginning to preach, after the sermon, he was hurried out of it, and thrown down the steps by the congregation, which was then breaking up. It appears that he had been generally well received in the county of York, and that he had convinced many.

In the year 1652, after having passed through the shires of Nottingham and Lincoln, he came again to Yorkshire. Here, in the course of his journey, he ascended Pendle Hill: at the top of this, he apprehended it was opened to him whither he was to direct his future steps, and that he saw a great host of people, who were to be converted by him in the course of his ministry. From this time we may consider him as having received his commission full and complete in his own mind. For in the vale of Beevor he conceived himself to have been informed of the various doctrines which it became his duty to teach; and, on this occasion, to have had an insight of the places where he was to spread them.

To go over his life, even in the concise way in which I have hitherto attempted it, would be to swell this Introduction into a volume. I shall, therefore, from this great period of his ministry, make only the following simple statement concerning it:

He continued his labors as a minister of the Gospel, and even preached within two days of his death.

During this time he settled meetings in most parts of the kingdom, and gave to these the foundation of that beautiful system of discipline, which I shall explain in this volume, and which exists among the Quakers at the present day.

---

*It is but justice to George Fox to observe, that it was not unusual for serious persons of different denominations in these times, when they had any thing of religious weight upon their minds, to unburthen themselves in the places of worship before the priest and people. It was a notion, countenanced by high authority, and received by many, that ministers, ordained only by man, had not an exclusive right of speaking in the church, but that all, who were properly gifted, might prophesy one by one. Conformably with this idea, those of the laity who rose up to speak on such occasions, generally postponed their remarks till the service was over, though there were individuals of different descriptions, who were not able to contain themselves till that time.

He traveled over England, Scotland, and Wales. He was in Ireland. He visited the British West-Indies, and America. He extended his travels to Holland, and part of Germany.

He wrote in this interval several religious books; and addressed letters to kings, princes, magistrates, and people, as he felt impressions on his mind, which convinced him that it became his duty to do it.

He experienced also, during this interval, great bodily sufferings. He was long and repeatedly confined in different gaols of the kingdom. The state of the gaols in these times is not easily to be conceived. That of Doomsdale, at Launceston in Cornwall, has never been exceeded for filth and pestilential noisomeness; nor those of Lancaster and Scarborough Castles for exposure to the inclemency of the elements. In the two latter he was scarcely ever dry for two years; for the rain used to beat into them, and to run down upon the floor. This exposure to the severity of the weather occasioned his body and limbs to be benumbed, and to swell to a painful size; and laid the foundation, by injuring his health, for future occasional sufferings during the remainder of his life.

With respect to the religious doctrines which George Fox inculcated during his ministry, it is not necessary to speak of them here, as they will be detailed in their proper places. I must observe, however, that he laid a stress upon many things, which the world considered to be of little moment, but which his followers thought to be entirely worthy of his spiritual calling. He forbade all the modes and gestures, which are used as tokens of obeisance, or flattery, or honor among men. He insisted on the necessity of plain speech or language. He declaimed against all sorts of music. He protested against the exhibitions of the theatre, and many of the accustomary diversions of the times. The early Quakers, who followed him in all these points, were considered by some as turning the world upside down: but they contended, in reply, that they were only restoring it to its pure and primitive state; and that they had more weighty arguments for acting up to their principles in these respects than others had for condemning them for so doing.

But whatever were the doctrines, whether civil, or moral, or religious, which George Fox promulgated, he believed that he had a Divine Commission for teaching them; and that he was to be the Restorer of Christianity; that is, that he was to bring people from Jewish ceremonies and Pagan fables, with which it had been intermixed, and also from worldly customs, to a religion, which was to consist of spiritual feeling. I know not how the world will receive the idea that he conceived himself to have had a revelation for these purposes. But nothing is more usual than for pious people, who have succeeded in any ordinary work of goodness, to say that "they were providentially led to it;" and this expression is usually considered among Christians to be accurate. But I cannot always find the difference between a man being providentially led into a course of virtuous and successful actions, and his having an internal revelation for it*. For if we admit that men may be providentially led upon such occasions, they may be led by the impressions upon their minds. But will not these internal impressions be as the dictates of an internal voice to those who follow them? But if pious men would believe themselves to have been thus providentially led, or acted upon, in any ordinary case of virtue, if it had been crowned with suc-

* Except in cases, where he may be supposed to be acted upon by the providential instrumentality of others.

cess, George Fox would have had equal reason to believe, from the success that attended his own particular undertaking, that he had been called upon to engage in it. For at a very early age he had confuted many of the professors of religion in public disputations. He had converted magistrates, priests, and people. Of the clergymen of those times some had left valuable livings, and followed him. In his thirtieth year he had seen no fewer than sixty persons spreading, as ministers, his own doctrines. These, and other circumstances which might be related, would doubtless operate powerfully upon him, to make him believe that he was a chosen vessel. Now, if to these considerations it be added, that George Fox was not engaged in any particular or partial cause of benevolence, or mercy, or justice, but wholly and exclusively in a religious and spiritual work, and that it was the first of all his religious doctrines, that the Spirit of God, where men were obedient to it, guided them in their spiritual concerns, he must have believed himself, on the consideration of his unparalleled success, to have been providentially led, or to have had an intenal or spiritual commission for the cause which he had undertaken.

But this belief was not confined to himself. His followers also believed in his commission. They had seen, like himself, the extraordinary success of his ministry. They acknowledged the same internal admonitions or revelations of the same Spirit in spiritual concerns. They had been witnesses of his innocent and blameless life. There were individuals in the kingdom, who had publicly professed sights and prophecies concerning him. At an early age he had been reported, in some parts of the country, as a youth who had "a discerning spirit." It had gone abroad that he had healed many persons, who had been sick of various diseases. Some of his prophecies had come true in the life-time of those, who had heard them delivered. His followers, too, had seen many, who had come purposely to molest and apprehend him, depart quietly, as if their anger and their power had been providentially broken. They had seen others, who had been his chief persecutors, either falling into misfortunes, or dying a miserable or an untimely death. They had seen him frequently cast into prison, but always getting out again by means of his innocence. From these causes the belief was universal among them, that his commission was of Divine authority; and they looked upon him, therefore, in no other light than that of a Teacher, who had been sent to them from Heaven.

George Fox was in figure above the ordinary size. He is described by William Penn as a "lusty person." He was graceful in his countenance. His eye was particularly piercing, so that some of those, who were disputing with him, were unable to bear it. He was in short manly, dignified, and commanding, in his aspect and appearance.

In his manner of living he was temperate. He ate sparingly. He avoided, except medicinally, all strong drink.

Notwithstanding the great exercise he was accustomed to take, he allowed himself but little sleep.

In his outward demeanor he was modest and without affectation. He possessed a certain gravity of manners, but he was nevertheless affable and courteous, and civil beyond the usual forms of breeding.

In his disposition he was meek, and tender, and compassionate. He was kind to the poor, without any exception; and, in his own Society, laid the foundation of that attention towards them, which the world remarks as an honor to the Quaker character at the present day. But the poor were not the only persons,

for whom he manifested an affectionate concern. He felt and sympathized wherever humanity could be interested. He wrote to the judges on the subject of capital punishments, warning them not to take away the lives of persons for theft. On the coast of Cornwall he was deeply distressed at finding the inhabitants more intent upon plundering the wrecks of vessels that were driven upon their shores, than upon saving the poor and miserable mariners who were clinging to them; and he bore his public testimony against this practice, by sending letters to all the clergymen and magistrates in the parishes bordering upon the sea, and reproving them for their unchristian conduct. In the West Indies also he exhorted those, who attended his meetings, to be merciful to their slaves, and to give them their freedom in due time He considered the latter as belonging to their families, and that religious instruction was due to these, as the branches of them, for whom one day or other they would be required to give a solemn account. Happy had it been if these Christian exhortations had been attended to, or if those families only, whom he thus seriously addressed, had continued to be true Quakers: for they would have set an example, which would have proved to the rest of the islanders, and the world at large, that the impolicy is not less than the wickedness of oppression Thus was George Fox, probably, the first person, who publicly declared against this species of slavery. Nothing, in short, that could be deplored by humanity, seems to have escaped his eye. And his benevolence, when excited, appears to have suffered no interruption in its progress by the obstacles, which bigotry would have thrown in the way of many, on account of the difference of a person's country, or of his color, or of his sect.

He was patient under his own sufferings. To those, who smote his right cheek, he offered his left; and, in the true spirit of Christianity, he indulged no rancor against the worst of his oppressors. He made use occasionally of a rough expression towards them; but he would never have hurt any of them, if he had had them in his power.

He possessed the most undaunted courage; for he was afraid of no earthly power. He was never deterred from going to meetings for worship, though he knew the officers would be there, who were to seize his person. In his personal conversations with Oliver Cromwell, or in his letters to him as Protector, or in his letters to the Parliament, or to king Charles the Second or to any other personage, he discovered his usual boldness of character, and never lost, by means of any degrading flattery, his dignity as a man.

But his perseverance was equal to his courage: for he was no sooner out of gaol than he repeated the very acts, believing them to be right, for which he had been confined. When he was forced also out of the meeting-houses by the officers of justice, he preached at the very doors. In short, he was never hindered but by sickness or imprisonment, from persevering in his religious pursuits.

With respect to his word, he was known to have held it so sacred, that the judges frequently dismissed him without bail, on his bare promise that he would be forth-coming on a given day. On these occasions he used always to qualify his promise by the expression "if the Lord permit."

Of the integrity of his own character, as a Christian, he was so scrupulously tenacious, that when he might have been sometimes set at liberty by making trifling acknowledgments, he would make none, lest it should imply a conviction that he had been confined for that which was wrong. And at one time in particular, king Charles the Second was so touched with the hardships of his case,

that he offered to discharge him from prison by a pardon. But George Fox declined it, on the idea that, as pardon implied guilt, his innocence would be called in question by his acceptance of it. The king, however, replied, that "he need not scruple being released by a pardon; for many a man, who was as innocent as a child, had had a pardon granted him." But still he chose to decline it. And he lay in gaol, till, upon a trial of the errors in his indictment, he was discharged in an honorable way.

As a minister of the Gospel he was singularly eminent. He had a wonderful gift in expounding the Scriptures. He was particularly impressive in his preaching; but he excelled most in prayer. Here it was that he is described by William Penn as possessing the most awful and reverend frame he ever beheld. "His presence," says the same author, "expressed a religious majesty."' That there must have been something more than usually striking either in his manner, or in his language, or in his arguments, or in all of them combined, or that he spoke "in the demonstration of the Spirit and with power," we are warranted in pronouncing, from the general and powerful effects produced. In the year 1648, when he had but once before spoken in public, it was observed of him at Mansfield, at the end of his prayer, "that it was then as in the days of the Apostles, when the house was shaken where they were." In the same manner he appears to have gone on, making a deep impression upon his hearers, whenever he was fully and fairly heard. Many clergymen, as I observed before, in consequence of his powerful preaching, gave up their livings; and constables, who attended the meetings in order to apprehend him, felt themselves disarmed, and went away without attempting to secure his person.

As to his life, it was innocent. It is true, indeed, that there were persons, high in civil offices, who, because he addressed the people in public, considered him as a disturber of the peace. But none of these ever pretended to cast a stain on his moral character. He was considered both by friends and enemies as irreproachable in his life.

Such was the character of the founder of Quakerism. He was born in July 1624, and died on the 13th of November, 1690, in the sixty-seventh year of his age. He had separated himself from the world in order to attend to serious things, as I observed before, at the age of nineteen; so that he had devoted himself to the exercises and services of religion for no less a period than forty-eight years. A few hours before his death, upon some Friends asking him how he found himself, he replied, "Never heed. All is well. The seed or power of God reigns over all, and over death itself. Blessed be the Lord!" This answer was full of courage, and corresponded with that intrepidity, which had been conspicuous in him during life. It contained an evidence, as manifested in his own feelings, of the tranquility and happiness of his mind, and that the power and terrors of death had been vanquished in himself. It showed also the ground of his courage and of his confidence. "He was full of assurance," says William Penn, "that he had triumphed over death, and so much so, even to the last, that death appeared to him hardly worth notice or mention." Thus he departed this life, affording an instance of the truth of those words of the psalmist, "Behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace."

CONTENTS.

PREFATORY ARRANGEMENTS AND REMARKS.

MORAL EDUCATION.

CHAPTER I.

Amusements distinguishable into useful and hurtful—the latter specified and forbidden.

CHAPTER II.

SECTION 1. Games of chance forbidden—history of the origin of some of these.

SEC. 2. Forbidden, as below the dignity of the intellect of man, and of his Christian character.

SEC. 3. As producing an excitement of the passions unfavorable to religious impressions—historical anecdotes of this excitement.

SEC. 4. As tending to produce, by the introduction of habits of gaming, an alteration in the moral character.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION 1. Music forbidden—instrumental innocent in itself, but greatly abused—the use of it almost inseparable from its abuse at the present day.

SEC. 2. Quakers can not learn instrumental, on the usual motives of the world—nor consider it as a source of moral improvement, or of solid comfort to the mind—but are fearful that, if indulged in, it would interfere with the Christian duty of religious retirement.

SEC. 3. Quakers cannot learn vocal, because, on account of its articulative powers, it is capable of becoming detrimental to morals—its tendency to this, as discoverable by an analysis of different classes of songs.

SEC. 4. The preceding, the arguments of the early Quakers—but the new state of music has produced others—these explained.

SEC. 5. An objection started to the different arguments of the Quakers on this subject—their reply.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION 1. The theatre forbidden—short history of its origin—and of its state and progress.

SEC. 2. Manner of the drama objected to by the Quakers—as it personates the characters of others—as it professes to reform vice.

SEC. 3. Contents of the drama objected to—as they hold out false sentiments—and weaken the sinews of morality.

SEC. 4. Theatre considered by the Quakers to be injurious to the happiness of man, as it disqualifies him for the pleasures of religion.

SEC. 5. To be injurious to the happiness of man, as it disqualifies him for domestic enjoyments.

SEC. 6. Opinions of the early Christians on this subject.

CHAPTER V.

SECTION 1. Dancing forbidden—light in which this subject has been viewed both by the ancients and the moderns—Quakers principally object to it where it is connected with public assemblies—they conceive it productive in this case of a frivolous levity, and of an excitement of many of the evil passions.

SEC. 2. These arguments of the Quakers on dancing examined in three supposed cases put to a moral philosopher.

SEC. 3. These arguments further elucidated by a display of the ball-room.

CHAPTER VI.

Novels forbidden—considered by the Quakers as producing an affectation of knowledge, a romantic spirit, and a perverted morality.

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION 1. Diversions of the field forbidden—general thoughtlessness upon this subject—sentiments of some of our best poets—law of the Quakers concerning it.

SEC. 2. Consistency of this law examined by the morality which is inculcated by the Old Testament.

SEC. 3. Examined by the morality of the New—these employments, if resorted to as diversions, pronounced in both cases to be a breach of a moral law.

CHAPTER VIII.

Objections to the preceeding system, which includes these different prohibitions, as a system of moral education.

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION 1. Reply of the Quakers to these objections.

SEC. 2. Further reply of the Quakers on the same subject.

DISCIPLINE.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION 1. Outlines of the discipline of the Quakers.

Sec. 2. Manner of the administration of this discipline.

Sec. 3. Charges usually brought against the administration of it—observations in answer to these charges.

Sec. 4. The principles of this dicipline applicable to the discipline of larger societies, or to the criminal codes of States—beautiful example in Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER II.

Monthly court or meeting of the Quakers for the purposes of their discipline—nature and manner of the business transacted there.

CHAPTER III.

Quarterly court or meeting for the same purposes—nature and manner of the business there.

CHAPTER IV.

Annual court or meeting for the same purposes—nature and manner of the business there—striking peculiarties in this manner—character of this discipline or government.

CHAPTER V.

Excommunication, or disowning—nature of disowning as a punishment.

PECULIAR CUSTOMS.

CHAPTER I.

Section 1. Dress—extravagance of the dress of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—plain manner in which the grave and religious were then habited—the Quakers sprang out of these.

Sec. 2. Quakers carried with them their plain dresses into their new Society—extravagance of the world continuing, they defined the objects of dress as a Christian people—at length incorporated it into their discipline—hence their present dress is only a less deviation from that of their ancestors than that of other people.

Sec. 3. Objections of the world to the Quaker dress—these examined—a comparison between the language of Quakerism and of Christianity on this subject—opinion of the early Christians upon it.

CHAPTER II.

Furniture—the Quakers use plain furniture—reasons for their singularities in this respect.

CHAPTER III.

Section 1. Language—Quakers have altered the common language—substitution of Thou for You—reasons for this change—opinions of many learned men concerning it.

Sec. 2. Various other alterations made, as in titles of address and of honor —reasons for these changes.

Sec. 3. Another alteration, as in the names of the days and months—reasons for this change—various new phases also introduced.

Sec. 4. Objections by the world against the alteration of Thou for You.

Sec. 5. Against that of titles of address and honor.

Sec. 6. Against that of the names of the days and months.

Sec. 7. Advantages and disadvantages of these alterations by the Quaker language.

CHAPTER IV.

Address—common personal gestures or worldly ceremonies of address forbidden—no exception in favor of royalty—reasons against the disuse of these.

CHAPTER V.

Manners and conversation—hospitality and freedom in Quakers' houses—their conversation more limited than that of others—subjects of conversation examined in our towns, and in the metropolis—extraordinary circumstance that takes place occasionally in the company of the Quakers.

CHAPTER VI.

Customs before meals—ancients made an oblation to Vesta—moderns have substituted grace—account of a Quaker grace.

CHAPTER VII.

Customs at and after meals—Quakers never drink healths or toasts—various reasons for their disuse of these customs—and seldom allow women to retire after dinner and leave the men drinking—Quakers a sober people.

CHAPTER VIII.

Section 1. Marriage—regulations and example of George Fox relative to marriage—present regulations and manner of the celebration of it among the Quakers.

Sec. 2. Those who marry out of the Society are disowned—various reasons for such a measure—objection to it—reply.

Sec. 3. But the disowned may be restored to membership—terms of their restoration—these terms censured—reply.

Sec. 4. More women disowned on this account than men—probable causes of this difference of number.

CHAPTER IX.

Section 1. Funerals—extravagance and pageantry of ancient and modern funerals—these discarded by the Quakers—plain manner in which they inter their dead.

Sec. 2. Quakers use no tomb-stones, nor monumental inscriptions—various reasons of their disuse of these.

Sec. 3. Neither do they use mourning garments—reasons why they thus differ from the world—these reasons further elucidated by considerations on court-mourning.

CHAPTER X.

Occupations—agriculture declining among the Quakers—causes and disadvantages of this decline.

CHAPTER XI.

SECTION 1. Trade—Quakers view trade as a moral question—prohibit a variety of trades and dealings on this account—various other wholesome regulations concerning it.

SEC. 2. But though the Quakers thus prohibit many trades, they are found in some which are considered objectionable by the world—these specified and examined.

CHAPTER XII.

Settlement of differences—abstain from duels—and also from law—have recourse to arbitration—their rules concerning arbitration—an account of an arbitration-society at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on Quaker-principles.

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION 1. Poor—no beggars among the Quakers—manner of relieving and providing for their poor.

SEC. 2. Education of the children of their poor provided for—observations on the number of the Quaker-poor—and on their character.

RELIGION.

Introduction.—Invitation to a perusal of this part of the work—the necessity of humility and charity in religion, on account of the limited powers of the human understanding—object of this invitation.

CHAPTER I.

God has given to all, besides an intellectual, a spiritual understanding—some have had a greater portion of this spirit than others, such as Abraham, and Moses, and the Prophets, and Apostles—Jesus Christ had it without limit or measure.

CHAPTER II.

Unless a man has a portion of the same Spirit which Jesus, and the Prophets, and the Apostles had, he cannot know spiritual things—this doctrine confirmed by St. Paul—and elucidated by a comparison between the faculties of men and of brutes.

CHAPTER III.

Neither, unless he has a portion of the same Spirit, can he know the Scriptures to be of Divine origin, nor can he spiritually understand them—objection to this doctrine—reply.

CHAPTER IV.

This Spirit, which has been given to men in different degrees, has been given them as a teacher or guide in their spiritual concerns—way in which it teaches.

CHAPTER V.

This Spirit may be considered as the primary and infallible guide—and the Scriptures but a secondary means of instruction—but the Quakers do not undervalue the latter on this account—their opinion concerning them.

CHAPTER VI.

This Spirit, as a primary and infallible guide, has been given to men universally—from the Creation to Moses—from Moses to Christ—from Christ to the present day.

CHAPTER VII.

Section 1. And as it has been given universally to men, so it has been given them sufficiently—they, who resist it, quench it—those, who attend to it, are in the way of redemption.

Sec. 2. This Spirit, then, besides its office of a spiritual guide, performs that of a Redeemer to men—redemption outward and inward—inward effected by this Spirit.

Sec. 3. Inward redemption produces a new birth—and leads to perfection—this inward redemption possible to all.

Sec. 4. New birth and perfection more particularly explained—new birth as real from "the spiritual seed of the Kingdom," as that of plants and vegetables from their seeds in the natural world—and goes on in the same manner progressively to maturity.

CHAPTER VIII.

Section 1. Possibility of redemption to all denied by the favorers of "Election and Reprobation"—Quaker refutation of the latter doctrine.

Sec. 2. Quaker refutation continued.

CHAPTER IX.

Recapitulation of all the doctrines advanced—objection that the Quakers make every thing of the Spirit, and but little of Jesus Christ—attempt to show that Christians often differ without a just cause—or that there is no material difference between the creed of the Quakers and that of the objectors on this subject.

CHAPTER X.

Section 1. Ministers of the Gospel—Quakers conceive that the Spirit of God alone can qualify for the ministry—women equally qualified with men.

Sec. 2. Way in which ministers are called and acknowledged among the Quakers—Quaker ministers, when acknowledged, engage in family visits—nature of these—and sometimes in missions through England—and sometimes in foreign parts.

CHAPTER XI.

Elders—their origin and their office—these are not to meddle with the discipline of the Church.

CHAPTER XII.

SECTION 1. Worship—is usually made to consist of prayer and preaching—but neither of these is considered by the Quakers to be effectual without the aid of the Spirit—hence no liturgy or studied form of words among the Quakers—reputed manner and character of Quaker preaching—observations upon these.

SEC. 2. Silent worship—manner of it—worship not necessarily connected with words—advantages of this mode of worship.

SEC. 3. Quakers discard every thing formal and superstitious from their worship—no consecrated ground—no priests' garments—no psalmody—no one day esteemed by them holier than another—reasons for these singularities.

CHAPTER XIII.

Miscellaneous particularities—Quakers seldom use the words "Original Sin," or "Trinity," and never "the Word of God" for the Scriptures—believe in the manhood and divinity of Christ—in the resurrection—their ideas on Sanctification and Justification.

CHAPTER XIV.

Quakers reject Baptism and the Lord's Supper—indulgence solicited for them on account of the difficulties connected with these subjects—these difficulties explained.

CHAPTER XV.

SECTION 1. Two baptisms, that of John, and of Christ—that of John was by water—and a Jewish ordinance—John the last prophet under the Law.

SEC. 2. Baptism of Christ was by the Spirit—this the baptism of the Gospel—authorities on which this distinction between the two is founded.

SEC. 3. Quakers conceive it was not the baptism of John, which Jesus included in the great commission when he ordered his Disciples to go into all nations and to teach them, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost—this shown from expressions taken from St. Peter and St. Paul—and from the object and nature of this baptism.

SEC. 4. But that it was the baptism of Christ—this shown from a critical examination of the words in the commission itself—and from the commission, as explained by St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul.

SEC. 5. Practice of Jesus and the Apostles a confirmation of this opinion.

CHAPTER XVI.

SECTION 1. Two Suppers, the one instituted by Moses, the other by Jesus Christ—the first called the Passover—ancient and modern manner of its celebration.

SEC. 2. Second, enjoined by Jesus at Capernaum—this wholly of a spiritual nature—way in which this may be enjoyed.

SEC. 3. Quakers say that Jesus instituted no new Supper distinct from that of

the Passover, and which was to render null and void that enjoined at Capernaum, as a rite of the Christian Church—no such institution to be collected from St. Matthew, St. Mark, or St. John.

Sec. 4. Nor from St. Luke—St. Luke only says, that all future Passover suppers of the Disciples with Christ, were to be spiritual—but if, as Jews, they could not all at once abdicate the Passover to which they had been educated, they were to celebrate it with a new meaning—but no acknowledged permission of it to others.

Sec. 5. Nor from St. Paul—St. Paul only says that the Passover, as spiritualized by Jesus, was allowed to his disciples, or to the Jewish converts who could not all at once lay aside their prejudices concerning it, but that it was to last only for a time—different opinions about this time—that of the Quakers concerning it.

Sec. 6. Had a new Supper, distinct from that of the Passover, been intended as a ceremonial of the Christian Church, it would have been commanded to others besides the Disciples, and its duration would not have been limited—reasons from St. Paul, to show that he himself did not probably consider it as a Christian ordinance—whereas the Supper, enjoined at Capernaum, was to be eternal—and universal—and an essential with all Christians.

GREAT TENETS.

CHAPTER I.

Civil Government—governors have no right to interfere in matters of religion—nor are the governed bound to obey, where their consciences are oppressed by doing it—but they are to be willing to suffer the penalties annexed to their disobedience—and they are on no account to resist them by force of arms.

CHAPTER II.

Oaths—Christians are not to take Civil oaths—reasons of the Quakers for their disuse of them.

CHAPTER III.

Section 1. War—unlawful for Christians to fight—scriptural passages in support of this tenet—answers to these, and replies.

Sec. 2. These passages supported by the opinions and practice of the early Christians.

Sec. 3. Objection to the motive assigned for this practice—reply to this objection—motive confirmed.

Sec. 4. Conduct of the early Christians further examined—while Christianity continued pure, they held it unlawful to fight—as it became less pure, their scruples against war declined—as it became corrupt, they ceased.

Sec. 5. Reflections of the Author on the foregoing subject—supposed conversation with a superior being in another region—new arguments from thence.

Sec. 6. Subject further considered—erroneous conceptions of those who argue in favor of the necessity of wars—these necessary only where the policy

of the world is pursued—nature of this policy—but not necessary, where men act on the policy of the Gospel.

Sec. 7. This doctrine confirmed by historical cases.

Sec. 8. Final examination of the subject.

CHAPTER IV.

Section 1. Maintenance of a Gospel-ministry—Quakers hold it unlawful to pay their own ministers, or those of any other denomination, for their Gospel labors—scriptural passages and historical facts relative to this doctrine.

Sec. 2. Additional reasons against the payment of those of another denomination, as collected from a History of Tithes.

Sec. 3. A more particular statement of these reasons.

CHARACTER.

CHAPTER I.

Character of the Quakers—difficulties in the proper estimation of character—these removable in the present case.

CHAPTER II.

Character general or particular—their general, is that of a moral people.

CHAPTER III.

Section 1. Character particular—first of their particular traits is benevolence to man in his temporal capacity.

Sec. 2. Second is benevolence to man in his religious capacity.

Sec. 3. Third is benevolence or a tender feeling for the brute-creation.

CHAPTER IV.

Fourth is complacency of mind and manners.

CHAPTER V.

Fifth is that they do not sacrifice their consciences, as a body of Christians, where they believe a compliance with any law or custom to be wrong.

CHAPTER VI.

Sixth is that in political affairs they reason upon principle, and not upon consequences.

CHAPTER VII.

Seventh is independence of mind.

CHAPTER VIII.

Section 1. Eighth is courage in life.

Sec. 2. Ninth is courage in death.

CHAPTER IX.

Tenth is punctuality to words and engagements.

CHAPTER X.

Imperfect traits—these are either intellectually or morally defective—first of these is a deficiency in literature and science, when compared with other people.

CHAPTER XI.

Second is superstition—distinctions on this subject.

CHAPTER XII.

Third is obstinacy—no foundation for this trait.

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION 1. Fourth is a money-getting spirit—this spirit seldom chargeable with avarice.

SEC. 2. Practicable methods suggested for the extirpation of it.

CHAPTER XIV.

Fifth is a want of animation or affection—this an appearance only.

CHAPTER XV.

Sixth is evasiveness in speech—no foundation for this trait.

CHAPTER XVI.

Seventh is slyness—this an appearance only.

CHAPTER XVII.

Eighth is a disregard of truth—inconsistency of the imputation of this trait.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SECTION 1. Character of the Quaker women—women share in the virtues of the men, but do not partake of all their reputed imperfections.

SEC. 2. Quaker women have a public character—influence of this upon their minds.

MISCELLANEOUS PARTICULARS.

CHAPTER I.

Quakers a happy people—subordinate causes of this happiness.

CHAPTER II.

Good which the Quakers have done as a Society upon earth.

CHAPTER III.

Quakers in England on the decline in point of numbers, as a religious Society —certain causes of this decline.

CHAPTER IV.

Supposed remedies for the diminution of some of these causes—these of various kinds—one of these a superior education—supposed effect of this education.

CHAPTER V.

Component parts of this education—favorable state of the Society for the admission of it.

CHAPTER VI.

Various arguments against it—these examined.

CHAPTER VII.

Conclusory remarks, as they relate to those who may have had thoughts of leaving the Society.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusory remarks, as they relate to those who may be called the world.

INDEX*.

A

ADDRESS, complimentary, forbidden..... 140
AGRICULTURE, declining among the Quakers..... 177
AMUSEMENTS, necessary for youth—the useful distinguished from the hurtful.. 5
ARBITRATION, all differences to be settled by—advantages of such a mode of settlement..... 190

B

BAPTISM, rejected by the Quakers—difficulties on this subject; twofold, by Water and by the Spirit; the latter is that of the Gospel; why the former does not belong to it; why the latter does; practice of Jesus Christ and of the Apostles considered.....289–313
BIRTH, (new,) explained; more particular explanation of it.....235–240

C

CEREMONIES, complimentary, forbidden. See ADDRESS.
CHARACTER, difficulties in the proper estimation of it in general—is that of a moral people; particular, as it relates to perfect traits, is that of a sober people. See HEALTHS. And that they are benevolent to man in his temporal and in his religious capacity; and to the brute-creation; that they exhibit a complacency of mind and manners; that they do not sacrifice their consciences by complying with what they disapprove; that in political matters they reason upon principle and not upon consequences; that they show extraordinary independence of mind; and fortitude in life; and courage in death; and are punctual to their words and engagements; particular, as it relates to imperfect traits—is that they are deficient in literature and science, when compared with others; and superstitious; and obstinate; and that they have a money-getting spirit; practicable methods suggested for the extirpation of this trait; and that they are wanting in animation and affection; and evasive in speech; and sly; and not observent of the truth; five of the latter or imperfect traits without any just foundation. (Of the Quaker-women). These genarally share in

* The figures in the Index do not always refer to the page, but to the beginning of the section or chapter, in which the subject is to be found.

the virtues of the men, but seldom in their imperfection; they have a public character—influence of this upon their minds, 294–454. (Of the Quaker-poor). See Poor.
Conclusory Remarks, as they relate to those, who may wish to leave the Society; and as they relate to the world..... 498
Conversation and Manners. See Manners.

D

Dancing forbidden—different views of the ancients and moderns concerning it—reasons for its prohibition; these examined in three supposed cases; the subject further elucidated.....40–45
Days, no one holier than another, 281; names of, altered. See Language.
Discipline (of the Quakers), outlines of it; manner of its administration; charges against this manner—reply; principles of this discipline applicable to the jurisprudence of states; monthly meeting for discipline; quarterly; yearly.....71–99
Disowning..... 99
Divinity and manhood of Christ—Quakers believe in the..... 285
Dress of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; origin of that of the Quakers—objects of it defined by the Society—and incorporated into their discipline; objections against it—Christianity not indifferent as to dress—opinions of the early Christians on this subject, 103–106. (Of ministers of the Gospel) among the Quakers not different from that of others. See Forms.

E

Education (moral) of the Quakers, as consisting of so many prohibitions, objected to; answer of the Quakers to these objections; answer continued; Holy Spirit the safest and best preservative of morals, but education may be made a secondary preservative of them—should consist of prohibitions and of knowledge, which, by creating a love for sublime things, would produce a dislike of frivolous, and thus afford a preservative against the fascinating amusements of the world—how much an education would operate to this end. Subject resumed—two objects in education, the improvement of the understanding and of the heart—without the improvement of the latter, education loses half its value—advantages of a classical one—of a philosophical one—and of general reading; reputed disadvantages of these..... 5
Elders, their origin and office..... 268
Election and Reprobation—manner in which the Quakers attempt to refute this doctrine..... 244

F

Field Diversions forbidden; inconsistent with the principles of the Old Testament; and with those of the New..... 52
Forms, every thing formal in worship rejected by the Quakers..... 281
Fox (George), Founder of the Society—his life. See Introduction.
Friends, Quakers known to each other by the name of. See Introduction.

FUNERALS, manner of conducting these among the Quakers..... 170
FURNITURE, Quakers use plain—reasons..... 115

G

GAMING, history relating to it; forbidden as below the dignity of the intellect of man; and as producing dangerous excitements of the passions; and as ruining the moral character..... 6
GOVERNMENTS (civil), tenet of the Quakers concerning it..... 334
GRACE (before meals), principle and manner of, among the Quakers..... 150
GROUND (consecrated), Quakers have no faith in. See FORMS.

H

HEALTHS, drinking of discarded..... 154

I

IMAGINATIONS, mischief of confounding with divine revelation..... 429

J

JUSTIFICATION and Sanctification..... 285

K

KNOWLEDGE, injudicious depreciation of, among the Quakers; great advantages of it to their character; knowledge without religion loses half its value; practicability of their union; many men of knowledge among the ancient Quakers..... 477–483

L

LANGUAGE, Quakers use Thou for You; discard titles of address and honor; alter names of the days and months; objections to these several singularities; advantages and disadvantages of them..... 119–124
LITURGY, none used among the Quakers. See WORSHIP.

M

MANHOOD and Divinity of Christ, Quakers believe in. See DIVINITY.
MANNERS and Conversation—description of, among the Quakers—comparison between them and others on these subjects—extraordinary circumstance of sitting in silence, when in company..... 144
MARRIAGE, regulations concerning—manner of its celebration; persons marrying out of the Society disowned; terms of their restoration to membership; more women disowned on this account than men..... 161
MINISTERS of the Gospel (among the Quakers) not distinguished by any particular dress. See FORMS; qualifications for; way in which they are acknowledged—duties in which they engage; never paid for their spiritual labors—all such payments held unlawful; ministers (of the Establishment) —held unlawful to pay these also—history of tithes; reasons from hence against the payment of the latter..... 259–380
MONTHS, names of, altered. See LANGUAGE.

Monumental Inscriptions, disused..... 172
Mourning Garments, disused..... 175
Music (instrumental), abuse of it at the present day; forbidden on account of the motives connected with it—of its incapability of producing moral improvement—of its interference with religious retirement; (vocal) forbidden, as capable of injury to morals, deducible from an analysis of songs; new state of music has produced other arguments against it; objections to the foregoing argument, and reply..... 15

N

Novels, forbidden, as producing an affectation of knowledge—a romantic spirit—and a perverted morality..... 48

O

Oaths, unlawful in Christianity..... 337
Occupations of the Quakers..... 177

P

Perfection, doctrine of. See Birth.
Pews, none in the meeting houses of the Quakers—the women sit apart from the men. See Forms.
Poor (Quaker), manner of supporting them; their children educated—character of the Quaker poor..... 195
Psalmody, disused. See Forms.

Q

Quakerism, what the profession of it is..... 1
Quakers, known to each other by the name of Friends. See Introduction. Origin of the name of Quakers; a happy people—subordinate causes of this happiness; good which they have done as a Society upon earth; supposed to be rather on the decline in England—causes assigned for this decline; supposed remedies for the diminution of some of these causes; many learned men among the first Quakers; character of the men of this Society—and of the women—and of the poor belonging to it. See Character.

R

Redemption, effected by two means—by outward, or by the sacrifice of Christ—by inward, or by the influence of the Holy Spirit..... 232
Religion, necessity of liberality or charity in..... 201
Reprobation, doctrine of. See Election.
Resurrection, Quakers believe in, but not as many others..... 285
Revelation, mischief of confounding our own imaginations with. See Imagination.

S

Sacrament, or Supper of the Lord—rejected by the Quakers—difficulties on this subject; two suppers—the one, or Passover, a ceremonial, instituted

by Moses; the other, spiritual, commanded by Jesus Christ at Capernaum; no new ceremonial supper instituted by the latter according to Matthew, Mark, and John; nor according to St. Luke—what this Evangelist is said to mean; nor according to St. Paul—what this Apostle is said to mean; further observations, showing that the supper at Capernaum is the only supper for Christians..... 289

SANCTIFICATION and Justification. See JUSTIFICATION.

SCRIPTURES, great advantages of them as acknowledged by the Quakers..... 219

SILENCE, custom of sitting in. See MANNERS. Silent meetings. See WORSHIP.

SIN (original), term never used by the Quakers; men not guilty of sin, till they have committed it..... 158

SPIRIT, (Holy,) different measures of it given; without it no knowledge of spiritual things; nor understanding of the Scriptures; a teacher in spiritual concerns; a primary and infallible guide; given universally; given sufficiently; becomes an inward Redeemer to man; produces a new birth, and leads to perfection; Quakers said to make every thing of the Spirit, and but little of Jesus Christ—answer to this objection.....207–230

T

THOU substituted for You. See LANGUAGES.

THEATRE, short history of it; forbidden on account of the manner of the drama: and of its contents; because, also, it disqualifies for the pleasures of religion; and for those of domestic happiness; opinion of the early Christians concerning it..... 27

TITHES, history of, Quakers hold it unlawful to pay them..... 385

TITLES of address and honor. See LANGUAGE.

TOASTS, drinking of, disused. See HEALTHS.

TOMB-STONES. See MONUMENTAL INSCRIPTIONS.

TRADE, regulations made by the Quakers concerning it; some trades, in which they are found, judged inconsistent with their professions—examination of this subject..... 180

TRINITY, term seldom used by the Quakers—their views of the subject..... 285

V

VAULTS, (under ground,) Quakers seldom buried in. See MONUMENTAL INSCRIPTIONS.

W

WAR, Quakers hold it unlawful; opinions and practice of the early Christians in their favor; objection raised and answered; practice of the early Christians examined further; reflection s of the Author on war; war necessary only, where the policy of the world is pursued, but not where men follow the policy of the Gospel; historical cases in support of this doctrine; final examination of the subject..... 343

WOMEN, (among the Quakers,) permitted to preach equally with the men; sit apart from them in their meeting for worship. See FORMS. Seldom leave the men drinking after dinner, as is often the case in other companies; their character. See CHARACTER.

WORD of God, Scriptures never so called by the Quakers..... 285
WORSHIP, (oral,) usually said to consist of prayer and preaching—but neither effectual without the aid of the Spirit—no Liturgy among the Quakers; (silent), many silent meetings among them—nature and advantages of these..... 270

PREFATORY ARRANGEMENTS

AND REMARKS.

Quakerism a High Profession—Quakers generally allowed to be a Moral People—Various Causes of this Morality of Character—Their Moral Education, which is one of them, the First Subject for Consideration—This Education Universal among them—Its Origin—The Prohibitions Belonging to it Chiefly to be Considered.

George Fox never gave, while living, nor left, after his death, any definition of Quakerism. He left, however, his journal behind him, and he left what is of equal importance, his example. Combining these with the sentiments and practice of the early Quakers, I may state, in a few words, what Quakerism is, or at least what we may suppose George Fox intended it to be.

Quakerism may be defined to be an attempt, under the divine influence, at practical Christianity, as far as it can be carried. They, who profess it, consider themselves bound to regulate their opinions, words, actions, and even outward demeanor, by Christianity, and by Christianity alone. They consider themselves bound to give up such of the customs or fashions of men, however general or generally approved, as militate, in any manner, against the letter or the spirit of the Gospel. Hence, they mix but little with the world, that they may be less liable to imbibe its spirit. Hence, George Fox made a distinction between the members of his own society and others, by the different appellations of Friends, and People of the world. They consider themselves also under an obligation to follow virtue, not ordinarily, but even unto death. For they profess never to make a sacrifice of conscience; and therefore, if any ordinances of man are enjoined them, which they think to be contrary to the divine will, they believe it right not to submit to them, but rather, after the example of the Apostles and primitive Christians, to suffer any loss, penalty, or inconvenience, which may result to them for so doing.

This then in a few words, is a general definition of Quakerism.* It is, as we see, a most strict profession of practical virtue under the direction of Christianity, and such as, when we consider the infirmities of human nature, and the temptations that daily surround it, it must be exceedingly difficult to act up to. But whatever difficulties may have lain in the way; or however, on account of the necessary weakness of human nature, the best individuals among the Quakers may have fallen below the pattern of excellence which they have copied, nothing is more true, than that the result has been,—that the whole Society, as a body, have obtained from their countrymen the character of a moral people.

If the reader is a lover of virtue, and anxious for the moral improvement of mankind, he will be desirous of knowing what means the Quakers have used, to preserve, for a hundred and fifty years, this desirable reputation in the world.

If he were to put the question to the Quakers themselves for their opinion upon it, I believe I can anticipate their reply. They would attribute any morality, they might be supposed to have, to the Supreme Being, whose will, having been discovered by means of the Scriptures, and of religious impressions upon the mind when it has been calm and still, and abstracted from the world, they have endeavored to obey. But there is no doubt that we may add auxiliary causes for this morality, and such as they themselves would allow to have had their share in producing it, under the same influence. The first of these may be called their Moral Education. The second, their Discipline. The third may be said to consist of those domestic or other Customs, which are peculiar to them as a society of Christians. The fourth, of their peculiar Tenets of Religion. In fact, there are many circumstances interwoven into the constitution of this Society, each of which has a separate effect, and all of which have a combined tendency, towards the productions of moral character.

These auxiliary causes I shall consider and explain in their turn. In the course of this explanation the reader will see, that, if other people were to resort to the same means as the Quakers, they would obtain the same reputation; or, that human nature is not so stubborn but that it will yield to a given force. But as it is usual, in examining the life of an individual, to begin with his youth, or, if it has been eminent, to begin with the education he has received, so I

* I wish to be understood, in writing this work, that I can give no account that will be applicable to all under the name of Quakers. My account will comprehend the general practice, or that which ought to be the practice, of those who profess Quakerism.

shall fix upon the first of the auxiliary causes I have mentioned, or the Moral Education of the Quakers, as the subject of the first division of my work.

Of this moral education I may observe here, that it is universal among the Society, or that it obtains where the individuals are considered to be true Quakers. It matters not how various the tempers of young persons may be who come under it; they must submit to it. Nor does it signify what may be the disposition, or the whim and caprice of their parents; they must submit to it alike. The Quakers believe that they have discovered that system of morality which Christianity perscribes; and therefore that they can give no dispensation to their members, under any circumstances whatever, to deviate from it. The origin of this system, as a standard of education in the Society, is as follows.

When the first Quakers met in union, they consisted of religious or spiritually-minded men. From that time to the present there has always been, as we may imagine, a succession of such in the Society. Many of these, at their great meetings, which have been annual since those days, have delivered their sentiments on various interesting points. These sentiments were regularly printed, in the form of yearly epistles, and distributed among Quaker families. Extracts, in process of time, were made from them, and arranged under different heads, and published in one book under the name of "Advices."* Now these advices comprehend important subjects. They relate to Customs, Manners, Fashions, Conversation, Conduct. They contain, of course, recommendations, and suggest prohibitions to the Society, as rules of guidance; and as they came from spiritually-minded men, on solemn occasions, they are supposed to have had a spiritual origin. Hence, Quaker-parents manage their youth according to these recommendations and prohibitions; and hence, this Book of Extracts (for so it is usually called), from which I have obtained a considerable portion of my knowledge on this subject, forms the basis of the moral education of the Society.

Of the contents of this book, I shall notice, while I am treating upon this subject, not those rules which are of a recommendatory, but those which are of a prohibitory nature. Education is regulated either by recommendations, or by prohibitions, or by both conjoined. The former relate to things where there is a wish that youth should conform to them, but where a small deviation from them would not be considered as an act of delinquency publicly reprehensible. The

* The book is entitled, "Extracts from the Minutes made, and from the Advices given, at the Yearly Meeting of the Quakers in London, since its first Institution."

latter, to things where any compliance with them becomes a positive offence. The Quakers, in consequence of the vast power, which they have over their members by means of their dicipline, lay a great stress upon the latter. They consider their prohibitions, when duly watched and enforced, as so many barriers against vice, or preservatives of virtue. Hence, they are grand component parts in their moral education and hence I shall chiefly consider them in the chapters which are now to follow upon this subject.

MORAL EDUCATION OF THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

Moral education of the Quakers—Amusements necessary for youth—Quakers distinguish between the useful and the hurtful—the latter specified and forbidden.

When the blooming spring sheds abroad its benign influence, man feels it equally with the rest of created nature. The blood circulates more freely, and a new current of life seems to be diffused, in his veins. The aged man is enlivened, and the sick man feels himself refreshed. Good spirits and cheerful countenances succeed. But as the year changes in its seasons, and rolls round to its end, the tide seems to slacken, and the current of feeling to return to its former level.

But this is not the case with the young. The whole year to them is a kind of perpetual spring. Their blood runs briskly throughout; their spirits are kept almost constantly alive; and, as the cares of the world occasion no drawback, they feel a perpetual disposition to cheerfulness and to mirth. This disposition seems to be universal in them. It seems, too, to be felt by us all; that is, the spring, enjoyed by youth, seems to operate as spring to maturer age. The sprightly and smiling looks of children, their shrill, lively, and cheerful voices, their varied and exhilarating sports,—all these are interwoven with the other objects of our senses, and have an imperceptible though an undoubted influence in adding to the cheerfulness of our minds. Take away the beautiful choristers of the woods, and those who live in the country would but half enjoy the spring. So, if by means of any unparalleled pestilence the children of a certain growth were to be swept away, and we were to lose this infantile link in the chain of age, they who were left behind would find the creation dull, or experience an interruption in the cheerfulness of their feelings, till the former were successively restored.

The bodies as well the minds of children require exercise for their growth; and, as their disposition is thus lively and sportive,

such exercises as are amusing are necessary; and such amusements, on account of the length of the spring which they enjoy, must be expected to be long.

The Quakers, though they are esteemed an austere people, are sensible of these wants or necessities of youth. They allow their children most of the sports or exercises of the body, and most of the amusements or exercises of the mind, which other children of the island enjoy: but as children are to become men, and men are to become moral characters, they believe that bounds should be drawn, or that an unlimited permission to follow every recreation would be hurtful.

The Quakers, therefore, have thought it proper to interfere on this subject, and to draw the line between those amusements which they consider to be salutary, and those which they consider to be hurtful. They have accordingly struck out of the general list of these, such, and such only, as, by being likely to endanger their morality, would be likely to interrupt the usefulness and happiness of their lives. Among the bodily exercises, dancing, and the diversions of the field, have been proscribed. Among the mental, music, novels, the theatre, and all games of chance of every description, have been forbidden. These are the principal prohibitions which the Quakers have made on the subject of their moral education. They were suggested, most of them by George Fox, but were brought into the discipline, at different times, by his successors.

I shall now consider each of these prohibitions separately; and I shall give all the reasons, which the Quakers themselves give, why, as a society of Christians, they have thought it right to issue and enforce them.

CHAPTER II.

SECTION I.

Games of chance—Quakers forbid cards, dice, and other similar amusements—also concerns in lotteries—and certain transactions in the stocks—They forbid also all wagers and speculations by a moneyed stake—The peculiar wisdom of the latter prohibition, as collected from the history of some of the amusements of the times.

When we consider the depravity of heart, and the misery and ruin, that are frequently connected with gaming, it would be strange indeed if the Quakers, as highly professing Christians, had not endeavored to extirpate it from their own body.

No people, in fact, have taken more effectual measures for its suppression. They have proscribed the use of all games of chance, and of all games of skill that are connected with chance in any manner. Hence, cards, dice, horse-racing, cock-fighting, and all the amusements, which come under this definition, are forbidden.

But as there are certain transactions, independently of these amusements, which are equally connected with hazard, and which individuals might convert into the means of moral depravity and temporal ruin, they have forbidden these also, by including them under the appellation of gaming.

Of this discription are concerns in the lottery, from which all Quakers are advised to refrain. These include the purchase of tickets, and all insurance upon the same.

In transactions of this kind there is always a moneyed stake, and the issue is dependent upon chance. There is of course the same fascinating stimulus as in cards or dice, arising from the hope of gain. The mind also must be equally agitated between hope and fear, and the same state of desperation may be produced, with other fatal consequences, in the event of loss.

Buying and selling in the public stocks of the kingdom is a practice, which, under particular circumstances, is discouraged also. Where any of the members of the Society buy into the stocks, under under the idea that they are likely to obtain better security, or more permanent advantages,—such a transfer of their properties is allowable. But if any were to make a practice of buying and selling, week after week, upon speculation only,—such a practice would come under the denomination of gaming. In this case, like the preceding, it is evident that money would be the object in view; that the issue would be hazardous; and, if the stake or deposit were of great importance, the tranquility of the mind might be equally disturbed, and many temporal sufferings might follow.

The Society have thought it right, upon the same principle, to forbid the custom of laying wagers upon any occasion whatever, or of reaping advantage from any doubtful event by a previous agreement upon a moneyed stake. This prohibition, however, is not on record, like the former, but is observed as a traditional law. No Quaker parent would suffer his child, nor Quaker schoolmaster the children entrusted to his care, nor any member another, to be conconcerned in amusements of this kind without a suitable reproof.

By means of these prohibitions, which are enforced in a great measure by the discipline, the Quakers have put a stop to gaming more effectually than others, but particularly by means of the latter: for history has shown us, that we cannot always place a reliance on a mere prohibition of any particular amusement or employment as a

cure for gaming; because any pastime or employment, however innocent in itself, may be made an instrument for its designs. There are few customs, however harmless, which avarice cannot convert into the means of rapine on the one hand, and of distress on the other.

Many of the games which are now in use, with such pernicious effects to individuals, were not formerly the instruments of private ruin. Horse-racing was originally instituted with a view of promoting a better breed of horses for the services of man. Upon this principle it was continued. It afforded no private emolument to any individual. The bystanders were only spectators. They were not interested in the victory. The victor himself was remunerated, not with money, but with crowns and garlands,—the testimonials of public applause. But the spirit of gaming got hold of the custom, and turned it into a private diversion, which was to afford the opportunity of a private prize.

Cock-fighting, as we learn from Ælian, was instituted by the Athenians, immediately after their victory over the Persians, to perpetuate the memory of the event, and to stimulate the courage of the youth of Greece in the defence of their own freedom: and it was continued upon the same principle, or as a public institution for a public good. But the spirit of avarice seized it, as it has done the custom of horse-racing, and continued it for a private gain.

Cards, that is, European cards, were, as all are agreed, of a harmless origin. Charles the Sixth, of France, was particularly afflicted with the hypochondriasis. While in this disordered state, one of his subjects invented them, to give variety of amusement to his mind. From the court they passed into private families: and here the same avaricious spirit fastened upon them, and with its cruel talons clawed them, as it were, to its own purposes, not caring how much these little instruments of cheerfulness in human disease were converted into instruments for the extension of human pain.

In the same manner as the spirit of gaming has seized upon these different institutions and amusements of antiquity, and turned them from their original to new and destructive uses, so there is no certainty that it will not seize upon others, which may have been hitherto innocently resorted to, and prostitute them equally with the former. The mere prohibition of particular amusements, even if it could be enforced, would be no certain cure for the evil. The brain of man is fertile enough, as fast as one custom is prohibited, to fix upon another. And if all the games now in use were forbidden, it would be still fertile enough to invent others for the same purposes. The bird that flies in the air, and the snail that crawls upon the ground, have not escaped the notice of the gamester; but have been

made, each of them, subservient to his pursuits. The wisdom, therefore, of the Quakers, in making it to be considered as a law of the Society, that no member is to lay wagers, or reap advantages from any doubtful event by a previous agreement upon a moneyed stake, is particularly conspicuous; as, wherever it can be enforced, it must be an effectual cure for gaming. For we have no idea how a man can gratify his desire of gain by means of any of the amusements of chance, if he can make no moneyed arrangements about their issue.

SECTION II.

First argument for the prohibition of cards and similar amusements by the Quakers is, that they are below the dignity of the intellect of man, and of his moral and Christian character—Sentiments of Addison on this subject.

The reasons, which the Quakers give for the prohibition of cards, and of amusements of a similar nature, to the members of their own Society, are generally such as are given by other Christians; though they make use of one which is peculiar to themselves.

It has been often observed that the word Amusement is proper to characterize the employments of children; but that the word Utility is the only proper one to characterize the employments of men.

The first argument of the Society on this subject is of a complexion similar to that of the observation just mentioned. For, when they consider man as a reasonable being, they are of opinion that his occupations should be rational; and when they consider him as making a profession of the Christian religion, they expect that his conduct should be manly, serious, and dignified. But all such amusements as those in question, if resorted to for the filling up of his vacant hours, they conceive to be unworthy of his intellect, and to be below the dignity of his Christian character.

They believe also, when they consider man as a moral being, that it is his duty, as it is unquestionably his interest, to aim at the improvement of his moral character. Now one of the foundations on which this improvement must be raised, is knowledge. Knowledge, however, is only slowly acquired; and human life, or the time for the acquisition of it, is but short. It does not appear, therefore, in the judgment of this Society, that a person can have much time for amusements of this sort, if he is bent upon obtaining that object which will be most conducive to his true happiness, and to the end of his existence here.

Upon this first argument of the Quakers I shall only observe, lest it should be thought singular, that sentiments of a similar import are to be found in authors of a different religious denomination, and

of acknowledged judgment and merit. Addison, in one of his excellent chapters on the proper employments of life, has the following observation:—"The next method," says he, "that I would propose to fill up our time, should be useful and innocent diversions. I must confess I think it is below reasonable creatures to be altogether conversant in such diversions as are merely innocent, and have nothing else to recommend them, but that there is no hurt in them. Whether any kind of gaming has even thus much to say for itself, I shall not determine; but I think it is very wonderful to see persons of the best sense passing away a dozen hours together in shuffling and dividing a pack of cards, with no other conversation but what is made up of a few game-phrases, and no other ideas but those of red or black spots ranged together in different figures. Would not a man laugh to hear any one of this species complaining that life is short?

SECTION III.

Cards, on account of the manner in which they are generally used, produce an excitement of the passions—Historical anecdotes of this excitement — This excitement another cause of their prohibition by the Quakers, because it unfits the mind, according to their notions, for the reception of religious impressions.

The Quakers are not so superstitious as to imagine that there can be any evil in cards, considered abstractly as cards, or in some of the other amusements that have been mentioned. The red or the black images on their surfaces can neither pollute the fingers nor the minds of those who handle them. They may be moved about, and dealt in various ways, and no objectionable consequences may follow. They may be used, and this innocently, to construct the similitudes of things. They may be arranged so as to exhibit devices which may be productive of harmless mirth. The evil connected with them will depend solely upon the manner of their use. If they are used for a trial of skill, and for this purpose only, they will be less dangerous than where they are used for a similar trial with a moneyed stake. In the former case, however, they may be made to ruffle the temper; for, in the very midst of victory, the combatant may experience a defeat. In the latter case, the loss of victory will be accompanied by a pecuniary loss; and two causes, instead of one, of the excitement of the passions will operate at once upon the mind.

It seldom happens, and it is much to be lamented, either that children, or that more mature persons, are satisfied with amusements of this kind, so as to use them simply as trials of their skill.

A moneyed stake is usually proposed as the object to be obtained. This general attachment of a moneyed victory to cards is frequently productive of evil. It often generates improper feelings. It gives birth to uneasiness and impatience while the contest is in doubt, and not unfrequently to anger and resentment when it is over.

But the passions, which are thus excited among youth, are excited also, but worked up to greater mischief, where grown-up persons follow these amusements imprudently, than where children are concerned. For though avarice, and impatience, and anger, are called forth among children, they subside sooner. A boy, though he loses his all when he loses his stake, suffers nothing from the idea of having impaired the means of his future comfort and independence. His next week's allowance, or the next little gift, will set him right again. But when a grown-up person, who is settled in the world, is led on by these fascinating amusements so as to lose that which would be of importance to his present comfort, but more particularly to the happiness of his future life, the case is materially altered. The same passions, which harass the one, will harass the other; but the effects will be widely different. I have been told that persons have been so agitated before the playing of the card that was to decide their destiny, that large drops of sweat have fallen from their faces, though they were under no bodily exertions. Now what must have been the state of their minds when the card in question proved decisive of their loss? Reason must unquestionably have fled: and it must have been succeeded instantly either by fury or despair. It would not have been at all wonderful, if persons in such a state had lost their senses; or if, unable to contain themselves, they had immediately vented their enraged feelings either upon themselves, or upon others who were the authors or the spectators of their loss.

It is not necessary to have recourse to the theory of the human mind, to anticipate the consequences that would be likely to result to grown-up persons from such an extreme excitement of the passions. History has given a melancholy picture of these, as they have been observable among different nations of the world.

The ancient Germans, according to Tacitus, played to such desperation, that, when they had lost every thing else, they staked their personal liberty; and, in the event of bad fortune, became the slaves of the winner.

D'Israeli, in his Curiosities of Literature, has given us the following account:—"Dice," says he, "and that little pugnacious animal the cock, are the chief instruments employed by the numerous nations of the East, to agitate their minds and ruin their fortunes; to which

the Chinese, who are desperate gamesters, add the use of cards. When all other property is played away, the Asiatic gambler does not scruple to stake his wife or his child on the cast of a die, or on the strength and courage of a martial bird. If still unsuccessful, the last venture is himself.—

"In the island of Ceylon, cock-fighting is carried to a great height. The Sumatrans are addicted to the use of dice. A strong spirit of play characterizes a Malayan. After having resigned everything to the good fortune of the winner, he is reduced to a horrid state of desperation. He then loosens a certain lock of hair, which indicates war and destruction to all he meets. He intoxicates himself with opium, and, working himself up to a fit of phrensy, he bites and kills every one who comes in his way. But as soon as ever this lock is seen flowing, it is lawful to fire at the person, and to destroy him as soon as possible.—

"To discharge their gambling debts, the Siamese sell their possessions, their families, and at length themselves. The Chinese play night and day, till they have lost all they are worth, and then they usually go and hang themselves. In the newly-discovered islands of the Pacific Ocean they venture even their hatchets, which they hold as invaluable acquisitions, on running-matches. We saw a man, says Cook in his last Voyage, beating his breast and tearing his hair in the violence of rage, for having lost three hatchets at one of these races, and which he had purchased with nearly half of his property."

But it is not necessary to go beyond our own country for a confirmation of these evils. Civilized as we are beyond all the people that have been mentioned, and living where the Christian religion is professed, we have the misfortune to see our own countrymen engaging in similar pursuits, and equally to the disturbance of the tranquillity of their minds, and equally to their own ruin. They cannot, it is true, stake their personal liberty, because they can neither sell themselves, nor be held as slaves. But we see them staking their comfort, and all their prospects in life. We see them driven into a multitude of crimes. We see them suffering in a variety of ways. How often has duelling, with all its horrible effects, been the legitimate offspring of gaming! How many suicides have proceeded from the same source! How many persons in consequence of a violation of the laws, occasioned solely by gaming, have come to an ignominious and untimely end!

Thus it appears that gaming, wherever it has been practiced to excess, whether by cards, or by dice, or by other instruments, or whether among nations civilized or barbarous, or whether in ancient or modern times, has been accompanied with the most violent excite-

ment of the passions, so as to drive its votaries to desperation, and to ruin their morality and their happiness.

It is upon this excitement of the passions, which must have risen to a furious height, before such desperate actions as those which have been specified could have commenced, that the Quakers have founded their second argument for the prohibition of games of chance, or of any amusement or transaction connected with a moneyed stake. It is one of their principal tenets, as will be diffusively shown in a future volume, that the supreme Creator of the universe affords a certain portion of his own spirit, or a certain emanation of the pure principle, to all his rational creatures, for the regulation of their spiritual concerns. They believe, therefore, that stillness and quietness, both of spirit and of body, are necessary for them, as far as these can be attained. For how can a man, whose earthly passions are uppermost, be in a fit state to receive, or a man of noisy and turbulent habits be in a fit state to attend to, the spiritual admonitions of this pure influence? Hence, one of the first points in the education of this Society is, to attend to the subjugation of the will; to take care that every perverse passion be checked; and that the creature be rendered calm and passive. Hence, the children belonging to it are rebuked for all expressions of anger, as tending to raise those feelings which ought to be suppressed. A raising even of their voice beyond due bounds is discouraged, as leading to the disturbance of their minds. They are taught to rise in the morning in quietness, to go about their ordinary occupations with quietness, and to retire in quietness to their beds. Educated in this manner, we seldom see a noisy or an irascible Quaker. This kind of education is universal among true Quakers. It is adopted at home. It is adopted in their schools. The great and practical philanthropist John Howard, when he was at Ackworth, which is the great public school of the Society, was so struck with the quiet deportment of the children there, that he mentioned it with approbation in his work on Lazarettos, and gave to the public some of its rules as models for imitation in other seminaries.

But if the Quakers believe that this pure principle, if attended to, is an infallible guide to them in their religious or spiritual concerns; if they believe that its influences are best discovered in the quietness and silence of their senses; if, moreover, they educate with a view of producing such a calm and tranquil state; it must be obvious that they can never allow, either to their children, or to those of maturer years, the use of any of the games of chance, because these, on account of their peculiar nature, are so productive of sudden fluctuations of hope, and fear, and joy, and disappointment, that they are

calculated more than any other to promote a turbulence of the human passion.

SECTION IV.

Another cause of their prohibition is, that, if indulged in, they may produce habits of gaming—these habits alter the moral character—they occasion men to become avaricious; dishonest; cruel; and disturbers of the order of of nature—Observations by Hartley, from his essay on Man.

Another reason why the Quakers do not allow their members the use of cards and of similar amusements is, that, if indulged in, they may produce habits of gaming; which, if once formed, generally ruin the moral character.

It is in the nature of cards that chance should have the greatest share in the production of victory; and there is, as I have observed before, usually a moneyed stake. But where chance is concerned, neither victory nor defeat can be equally distributed among the combatants. If a person wins, he feels himself urged to proceed. The amusement also points out to him the possibility of a sudden acquisition of fortune without the application of industry. If he loses he does not despair. He still perseveres in the contest; for the amusement points out to him the possibility of repairing his loss. In short, there is no end of hope upon these occasions. It is always hovering about during the contest. Cards, therefore, and amusements of the same nature, by holding up prospects of pecuniary acquisitions on the one hand, and of repairing losses that may arise on any occasion on the other, have a direct tendency to produce habits of gaming.

Now the Quakers consider these habits as of all others the most pernicious; for they usually change the disposition of a man, and ruin his moral character.

From being generous-hearted they make him avaricious. The covetousness, too, which they introduce as it were into his nature, is of a kind that is more ordinarily injurious. It brings disease upon the body, as it brings corruption upon the mind. Habitual gamesters regard neither their own health nor their own personal convenience, but will set up night after night at play, though under bodily indisposition, if they can grasp only the object of their pursuit.

From a just and equitable, they often render him a dishonest person. Professed gamesters, it is well known, lie in wait for the young, the ignorant, and the unwary; and they do not hesitate to adopt fraudulent practices to secure them as their prey. Intoxication has also been frequently resorted to for the same purpose.

From humane and merciful, they change him into hard-hearted and barbarous. Habitual gamesters have no compassion either for men or brutes. The former they can ruin and leave destitute, without the sympathy of a tear. The latter they can oppress to death, calculating the various powers of their declining strength, and their capability of enduring pain.

They convert him from an orderly into a disorderly being, and into a disturber of the harmony of the universe. Professed gamesters sacrifice everything, without distinction, to their wants; not caring if the order of nature, or if the very ends of creation, be reversed. They turn day into night, and night into day. They force animated nature into situations for which it was never destined. They lay their hands upon things innocent and useful, and make them noxious. They lay hold of things barbarous, and render them still more barbarous by their pollutions.

Hartley, in his Essay upon Man, has the following observation upon gaming:

"The practice of playing at games of chance and skill is one of the principal amusements of life; and it may be thought hard to condemn it as absolutely unlawful, since there are particular cases of persons, infirm in body and mind, where it seems requisite to draw them out of themselves by a variety of ideas and ends in view, which gently engage the attention. But this reason takes place in very few instances. The general motives to play are avarice, joined with a fraudulent intention explicit or implicit, ostentation of skill, and spleen, through the want of some serious useful occupation. And as this practice arises from such corrupt sources, so it has a tendency to increase them; and indeed may be considered as an express method of begetting and inculcating self-interest, ill-will, envy, and the like. For, by gaming, a man learns to pursue his own interest solely and explicitly, and to rejoice at the loss of others as his own gain, grieve at their gain as his own loss; thus entirely reversing the order established by Providence for social creatures."

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

Music forbidden—General apology for the Quakers on account of their prohibition of so delightful a science—Music particularly abused at the present day—wherein this abuse consists—present use of it almost inseparable from this abuse.

Plato, when he formed what he called his pure republic, would not allow music to have any place in it. George Fox, and his follow-

ers, were of opinion that it could not be admitted in a system of pure Christianity. The modern Quakers have not differed from their predecessors on this subject; and therefore music is understood to be prohibited throughout the society at the present day.

It will doubtless appear strange, that there should be found people who object to an art, which is capable of being made productive of so much pleasurable feeling, and which, if it be estimated either by the extent or the rapidity of its progress, is gaining reputation in the world. But it may be observed, that "all that glitters is not gold." So neither is all that pleases the ear perfectly salubrious to the mind. There are few customs, against which some arguments or other may not be advanced; few, in short, which man has not perverted, and where the use has not become in an undue measure connected with the abuse.

Providence gave originally to man a beautiful and a perfect world. He filled it with things necessary, and things delightful: and yet man has often turned these from their true and original design. The very wood on the surface of the earth he has cut down, and the very stone and metal in its bowels he has hewn and cast, and converted into a graven image, and worshiped in the place of his beneficent Creator. The food, which has been given him for his nourishment, he has frequently converted by his intemperance into the means of injuring his health. The wine, that was designed to make his heart glad on reasonable and necessary occasions, he has used often to the stupefaction of his senses and the degradation of his moral character. The very raiment, which has been afforded him for his body, he has abused also, so that it has frequently become a source for the excitement of his pride.

Just so it has been, and so it is, with music at the present day.

Music acts upon our senses, and may be made productive of a kind of natural delight. For in the same manner as we receive through the organ of the eye a kind of involuntary pleasure when we look at beautiful arrangements, or combinations, or proportions, in nature, and the pleasure may be said to be natural, so the pleasure is neither less, nor less involuntary, nor less natural, which we receive through the organ of the ear from a combination of sounds, flowing in musical progression.

The latter pleasure, as it seems natural, so, under certain limitations, it seems innocent. The first tendency of music (I mean of instrumental) is to calm and tranquillize the passions. The ideas which it excites are of the pleasant, benevolent, and social kind. It leads occasionally to joy, to grief, to tenderness, to sympathy; but never to malevolence, ingratitude, anger, cruelty, or revenge: for no combination of musical sounds can be invented, by which the latter

passions can be excited in the mind without the intervention of the human voice.

But notwithstanding that music may thus be made the means both of innocent and pleasurable feeling, yet it has been the misfortune of man, as in other cases, to abuse it, and never probably more than in the present age. For the use of it, as it is at present taught, is almost inseparable from its abuse. Music has been so generally cultivated, and to such perfection, that it now ceases to delight the ear unless it comes from the fingers of the proficient. But great proficiency cannot be attained in this science without great sacrifices of time. If young females are to be brought up to it rather as to a profession than introduced to it as a source of occasional innocent recreation, or if their education is thought most perfect where their musical attainments are the highest, not only hours, but even years, must be devoted to the pursuit. Such a devotion to this one object must, it is obvious, leave less time than is proper for others that are more important. The knowledge of domestic occupations, and the various sorts of knowledge acquired by reading, must be abridged, in proportion as this science is cultivated to professional precision. And hence, independently of any arguments which the Quakers may advance against it, it must be acknowledged by the sober world to be chargeable with a criminal waste of time. And this waste of time is the more to be deprecated, because it frequently happens that, when young females marry, music is thrown aside, after all the years that have been spent in its acquisition, as an employment either then unnecessary, or as an employment which, amidst the new cares of a family, they have not leisure to follow.

Another serious charge may be advanced against music, as it is practised at the present day. Great proficiency, without which music now ceases to be delightful, cannot, as I have just observed, be made without great application, or the application of some years. Now all this long application is of a sedentary nature, But all occupations of a sedentary nature are injurious to the human constitution, and weaken and disorder it in time. But in proportion as the body is thus weakened by the sedentary nature of the employment, it is weakened again by the enervating powers of the art. Thus the nervous system is acted upon by two enemies at once; and in the course of the long education, necessary for this science, the different disorders of hysteria are produced. Hence the females of the present age, amongst whom this art has been cultivated to excess, are generally found to have a weak and languid constitution, and to be disqualified more than others from becoming healthy wives, or healthy mothers, or the parents of a healthy progeny.

SECTION II.

Instrumental music forbidden—Quakers cannot learn it on the motives of the world—It is not conducive to the improvement of the moral character—affords no solid ground of comfort; nor of true elevation of mind—A sensual gratification—Remarks of Cowper—And, if encouraged, would interfere with the duty, recommended by the Quakers, of frequent religious retirement.

The reader must always bear it in his mind, if the Quakers should differ from him on any particular subject, that they set themselves apart as a Christian community, aiming at Christian perfection; that it is their wish to educate their children, not as moralists or as philosophers, but as Christians; and that therefore, in determining the propriety of a practice, they will frequently judge of it by an estimate very different from that of the world.

The members of this Society do not deny that instrumental music is capable of exciting delight. They are not insensible either of its power or of its charms. They throw no imputation on its innocence, when viewed abstractly by itself. But they do not see anything in it sufficiently useful to make it an object of education, or so useful as to counterbalance other considerations which make for its disuse.

The Quakers would think it wrong to indulge in their families the usual motives for the acquisition of this science. Self-gratification without any object of usefulness, which is one of them, and reputation in the world, which is the other, are considered as not allowable in the Christian system. Add to which, that where there is a desire for such reputation, an emulative disposition is generally cherished, and envy and vain-glory are often excited in the pursuit.

They are of opinion also, that the learning of this art does not tend to promote the most important object of education,—the improvement of the mind. When a person is taught the use of letters, he is put into the way of acquiring natural, historical, religious, and other branches of knowledge, and of course of improving his intellectual and moral character. But music has no pretensions, they conceive, to the production of such an end. Polybius, indeed, relates that he could give no solid reason why one tribe of the Arcadians should have been so civilized, and the other so barbarous, but that the former were fond, and that the latter were ignorant, of music. But the Quakers would argue, that if music had any effect in the civilization, this effect would be seen in the manners, and not in the morals, of mankind. Musical Italians are esteemed a soft and effeminate, but they are generally reputed a depraved, people. Music, in short, though it breathes soft influences, cannot yet breathe morality into the mind. It may do to soften savages; but a Christian com-

munity, in the opinion of the Quakers, can admit of no better civilization than that, which the spirit of the Supreme Being, and an observance of the pure precepts of Christianity, can produce.

Music, again, does not appear to the members of this Society to be the foundation of any solid comfort in life. It may give spirits for the moment, as strong liquor does; but, when the effect of the liquor is over, the spirits flag, and the mind is again torpid. It can give no solid encouragement, nor hope, nor prospects. It can afford no anchorage-ground which shall hold the mind in a storm. The early Christians, imprisoned, beaten, and persecuted even to death, would have had but poor consolation, if they had not had a better friend than music to rely upon in the hour of their distress. And here, I think, the Quakers would particularly condemn music, if they thought it could be resorted to in the hour of affliction, inasmuch as it would then have a tendency to divert the mind from its true and only support.

Music, again, does not appear to them to be productive of elevated thoughts; that is, of such thoughts as raise the mind to sublime and spiritual things, abstracted from the inclinations, the temper, and the prejudices of the world. The most melodious sounds, that human instruments can make, are from the earth, earthy. But nothing can rise higher than its own origin. All true elevation, therefore, can only come, in the opinion of the Quakers, from the divine source.

The Quakers, therefore, seeing no moral utility in music, cannot make it a part of their education. But there are other considerations, of a different nature, which influence them the same way.

Music, in the first place, is esteemed a sensual gratification. Even those, who run after sacred music, never consider themselves as going to a place of devotion, but where, in full concert, they may hear the performance of the master-pieces of the art. This attention to religious compositions for the sake of the music has been noticed by one of our best poets.

> ——"and ten thousand sit,
> Patiently present at a sacred song,
> Commemoration mad, content to hear,
> O wonderful effect of music's power,
> Messiah's eulogy for Handel's sake!"
>
> COWPER.

But the Quakers believe that all sensual desires should be held in due subordination to the pure principle; or that sensual pleasures should be discouraged as much as possible, as being opposed to those spiritual feelings, which constitute the only perfect enjoyment of a Christian.

Music, again, if it were encouraged in the Society, would be considered as depriving those of maturer years of hours of comfort, which they now frequently enjoy, in the service of religion. Retirement is considered by the Quakers as a Christian duty. The members, therefore, of this Society are expected to wait in silence, not only in their places of worship, but occasionally in their families, or in their private chambers, in the intervals of their daily occupations, that, in stillness of heart and in freedom from the active contrivance of their own wills, they may acquire both directions and strength for the performance of the duties of life. The Quakers, therefore, are of opinion, that, if instrumental music were admitted as a gratification in leisure hours, it would take the place of many of these serious retirements, and become very injurious to their interests and their character as Christians.

SECTION III.

Vocal music forbidden—Singing in itself no more immoral than reading—but as vocal music articulates ideas, it may convey poison to the mind—Some ideas in songs contrary to Quaker notions of morality; as in hunting songs; or in Bacchanalian; or in martial—Youth make no selection; but learn all that fall in their way.

It is an observation of Lactantius, that "the pleasures we receive through the organ of the ears may be as injurious as those we receive through the organ of the eyes." He does not, however, consider the effect of instrumental music as much to be regarded, "because sounds, which proceed from air, are soon gone, and they give birth to no sentiment that can be recorded. Songs, on the other hand, or sounds from the voice, may have an injurious influence on the mind."

The Quakers, in their view of this subject, make the some distinction as this ancient father of the church. They have a stronger objection, if it be possible, to vocal than to instrumental music, Instrumental music, though it is considered to be productive of sensual delights, is yet supposed as incapable, on account of its inability to articulate, or its inability to express complex ideas, of conveying either unjust or impure sentiments to the mind. Vocal, on the other hand, is capable of conveying to it poison of this sort. For vocal music consists of songs, or of words musically expressed by the human voice. But words are the representatives of ideas, and as far as these ideas are pure or otherwise, so far may vocal music be rendered innocent or immoral.

The mere singing, it must be obvious, can be no more immoral than the reading of the same song. Singing is but another mode of

expressing it. The morality of the action will depend upon the words which it may contain. If the words in a song be pure, if the sentiments in it be just, and if it be the tendency of these to awaken generous and virtuous sympathies, the song will operate no otherwise than a lesson of morality. And will a lesson of morality be less serviceable to us because it is dressed up in poetry, and musically expressed by the human voice, than when it is conveyed to us in prose*? But if, on the other hand, the words in any song be in themselves unchaste, if they inculcate false honor, if they lead to false opinions, if they suggest sentiments that have a tendency to produce depraved feeling,—then vocal music, by which these are conveyed in pleasing accents to the ear, becomes a destroyer of morals, and cannot therefore be encouraged by any who consider purity of heart as required by the Christian religion. Now the Quakers are of opinion that the songs of the world contain a great deal of objectionable matter, in these respects; and that if they were to be promiscuously taken up by children, who have no power of descriminating between the good and the bad, and who generally lay hold of all that fall in their way, they would form a system of sentimental maxims very injurious in their tendency to their moral character.

If we were to take a collection of songs, as published in books, and were to examine these, we should find that such a system might easily be formed. And if again we were to examine the sentiments contained in many of these by the known sentiments of the Society on the several subjects of each, we should find that, as a highly-professing body, more objections would arise against vocal music among them than among other people.

Let us, for example, just glance at that class of songs, which in the collection would be called Hunting-songs. In these, men are invited to the pleasures of the chase, as to pleasures of a superior kind. The triumphs over the timid hare are celebrated in these with a kind of enthusiastic joy, and celebrated too as triumphs worthy of the character of men. Glory is even attached to these pursuits. But the Quakers, as it will appear in a future chapter, endeavor to prevent their youth from following any of the diversions of the field. They consider pleasures as placed on a false foundation, and triumphs as unmanly and inglorious, which are founded on circumstances connected with the sufferings of the brute-creation. They cannot, therefore, approve of songs of this order, because they consider them as disseminating sentiments that are both unreasonable and cruel.

---

* The Quakers, however, think that, even in this case, the moral lesson may be better conveyed, without the music of the voice, as singing it is apt to produce a volatile or frivolous spirit, which detracts from the serious impression of the sentiment.

Let us now go to another class, which may be found in the same collection; I mean the Bacchanalian. Men are invited here to sacrifice frequently at the shrine of Bacchus. Joy, good-humor, and fine spirits, are promised to those who pour out their libations in a liberal manner. An excessive use of wine, which injures the constitution and stupefies the faculties, instead of being censured in these songs, is sometimes recommended in them, as giving to nature that occasional stimulus which is deemed necessary for health. Poets, too, in their songs, have considered the day as made only for vulgar souls, but the night for the nobler sort of people, that they may the better pursue the pleasures of the bottle. Others have gone so far in their songs as to promise long life as a consequence of drinking; while others, who confess that human life may be shortened by such means, take care to throw out, that, as a man's life thus becomes proportionably abridged, it is rendered proportionably a merry one. Now the Quakers are so particularly careful with respect to the use of wine and spiritous liquors, that the Society are annually and publicly admonished to beware of excess. The Members of it are discouraged from going even to inns, but for the purposes of business and refreshment; and are admonished to take care that they stay there no longer than is necessary for such purposes. The Quakers, therefore, cannot be supposed to approve of any of the songs of this class, as far as they recommend or promote drunkenness. And they cannot but consider them as containing sentiments injurious to the morals of their children.

But let us examine another class of songs, that may be found in the same collection. These may be denominated the Martial. Now what is the tenor of these songs? The authors celebrate victories. They endeavor, regardless of the question, whether their own cause be a right or a wrong one, to excite joy at the events. It is their aim, frequently to rouse the soul to the performance of martial exploits, as to exploits the fullest of human glory. They frequently threaten enemies with new chastisements and new victories, and breathe the spirit of revenge. But the Quakers consider all wars, whether offensive or defensive, as against the spirit of the Christian religion. They cannot contemplate scenes of victory but with the eye of pity and the the tear of compassion for the suffering of their fellow creatures, whether countrymen or enemies, and for the devastation of the human race. They allow no glory to attach, nor do they give anything like an honorable reputation, to the Alexanders, the Cæsars, or to heroes either of ancient or modern date. They cannot, therefore, approve of songs of this class, because they conceive them to inculcate sentiments totally contrary to the mild and peaceful spirit of the Christian religion.

If we were to examine the collection further, we might pick out other songs, which might be reckoned of the class of the Impure. Among these would be found ideas so indelicate, that, notwithstanding the gloss which wit and humor had put over them, the chaste ear could not but be offended by their recital. It must be obvious, in this case also, that not only the Quakers, but all persons filling the stations of parents, would be sorry if their children were to come to the knowledge of some of these.

It is unnecessary to proceed further upon this subject. For the reader must be aware that, while the Quakers hold such sentiments, they can never patronize such songs; and that if they, who are taught or allowed to sing, generally lay hold of all the songs that come into their way, that is, promiscuously and without selection, the Quakers will have a strong ground, as a Christian society, or as a society who hold it necessary to be watchful over their words as well as their actions, for the rejection of vocal music.

SECTION IV.

The preceding are the arguments of the early Quakers—New state of music has produced new ones—Instrumental now censurable for a waste of time—for leading into company—for its connection with vocal.

The arguments which have hitherto appeared against the admission of music into education, are those which were nearly coæval with the Society itself. The incapability of music to answer moral ends; the sensuality of the gratification; the impediments it might throw in the way of religious retirement; the impurity it might convey to the mind; were in the mouths of the early Quakers. Music at that time was principally in the hands of those who made a livelihood of the art. They, who followed it as an accomplishment or as a recreation, were few, and these followed it with moderation. But since those days its progress has been immense. It has traversed the whole kingdom. It has got into almost all the families of rank and fortune. Many of the middle classes, in imitation of the higher, have received it. And as it has undergone a revolution in the extent, so it has undergone another in the object, of its practice. It is learnt now, not as a source of occasional recreation, but as a complicated science, where perfection is insisted upon to make it worthy of pursuit. In this new state, therefore, of music, new arguments have arisen on the part of the Quakers, which I shall now concisely explain.

The Quakers, in the first place, are of opinion that the learning of music, as it is now learnt, cannot be admitted by them as a Christian society, because, proficiency being now the object of it, as has been

before observed, it would keep them longer employed than is consistent with people who are commanded to redeem their time.

They believe also that music, in its present state, has an immediate tendency to lead into the company of the world. In former times, when music was followed with moderation, it was esteemed as a companion or as a friend. It afforded relaxation after fatigue, and amusement in solitary hours. It drew a young person to his home, and hindered him from following many of the idle diversions of the times. But now, or since it has been practised with a new object, it produces a different effect. It leads into company. It leads to trials of skill. It leads to the making up of festive parties. It leads, for its own gratification, to the various places of public resort. Now this tendency of leading into public is considered by the Quakers as a tendency, which threatens the dissolution of their Society. For they have many customs to keep up, which are quite at variance with those of the world. The former appear to be steep and difficult as common paths; those of the world to be smooth and easy. The natural inclination of youth, more prone to self-gratification than to self-denial, would prefer to walk in the latter; and the influence of fashion would point to the same choice. The liberty, too, which is allowed in the one case, seems more agreeable than the discipline imposed in the other. Hence it has been found, that, in proportion as young Quakers mix with the world, they generally imbibe its spirit, and weaken themselves as members of their own body.

They have an objection, again, to the learning of instrumental music on account of its almost inseparable connexion with vocal; in consequence of which it leads often to the impurity, which the latter has been shown to be capable of conveying to the mind.

This connexion does not arise so much from the circumstance, that those who learn to play generally learn to sing, as from another consideration. Musical people, who have acquired skill and taste, are desirous of obtaining every new musical publication, as it comes out. This desire is produced where there is an aim at perfection in this science. The professed novel-reader, we know, waits with impatience for a new novel. The politician discovers anxiety for his morning-paper. Just so it is with the musical amateur with respect to a new tune. Now though many of the new compositions come out for instrumental music only, yet others come out entirely as vocal. These consist of songs sung at our theatres, or at our public gardens, or at our other places of public resort; and are afterwards printed with their music and exposed to sale. The words, therefore, of these songs, as well as the music that is attached to them, fall into the hands of the young amateur. Now as such songs are not always chaste or delicate, and as they frequently contain such sentiments as

I have shown the Quakers to disapprove, the young musician, if of this Society, might have his modesty frequently put to the blush, or his delicacy frequently wounded, or his morality often broken in upon, by their perusal. Hence, though instrumental music might have no immoral tendency in itself, the Quakers have rejected it, among other reasons, on account of its almost inseparable connexion with vocal.

SECTION V.

Objections anticipated, that, though the arguments used by the Quakers in the preceding chapters are generally fair and positive, yet an exceptionable one seems to have been introduced, by which it appears to be inculcated, that the use of a thing ought to be abandoned on account of its abuse—Explanation of the distinction made by the Quakers in the use of this argument.

I purpose to stop for a while, and to make a distinction, which may now become necessary, with respect to the use of what may appear to be a Quaker-principle of argument, before I proceed to a new subject.

It may have been observed by some of my readers, that, though the Quakers have adduced arguments which may be considered as fair and positive on the subjects which have come before us, yet they appear to have advanced one, which is no other than that of condemning the use of a thing on account of its abuse. Now this mode of reasoning, it will be said, has been exploded by logicians, and for this, among other reasons; that, if we were bound to relinquish customs in consequence of it, we should be obliged to give up many things that are connected with the comforts, and even with the existence of our lives.

To this observation I must reply, that the Quakers never recommend an abstinence from any custom merely because the use of it may lead to its abuse.

Where a custom is simply liable to abuse, they satisfy themselves with recommending moderation in the use of it.

But where the abuse of a custom is either, in the first place, necessarily, or, in the second, very generally connected with the use of it, they commonly consider the omission of it as morally wise and prudent. It is in these two cases only that they apply, or that they lay any stress upon, the species of argument described.

This species of argument, under these two limitations, they believe to be tenable in Christian morals, and they entertain this belief upon the following grounds.

It may be laid down as a position, that the abuse of any custom, which is innocent in itself, is an evil, and that it may become a moral evil. And they conceive it to become a moral evil in the eye

of Christianity, when it occasions either the destruction of the health of individuals, or the misapplication of their time, or the excitement of their worst passions, or the loss of their moral character.

If, therefore, the use of any custom be necessarily (which is the first of the two cases) connected with its abuse, and the abuse of it be the moral evil described, the user or practiser cannot but incur a certain degree of guilt. This first case will comprehend all those uses of things which go under the denomination of gaming.

If, again, the use of a custom be either through the influence of fashion, or its own seductive nature, or any other cause, very generally (which is the second case) connected with its abuse, and the abuse be also of the nature supposed, then the user or practiser, if the custom be unnecessary, throws himself wantonly into danger of evil, contrary to the watchfulness which Christianity enjoins in morals; and, if he fall, falls by his own fault. This watchfulness against moral danger the Quakers conceive to be equally incumbent upon Christians as watchfulness upon persons against the common dangers of life. If two-thirds of all the children, who had ever gone to the edge of a precipice to play, had fallen down and been injured, it would be a necessary prudence in parents to prohibit all such goings in future. So they conceive it to be only a necessary prudence in morals to prohibit customs, where the use of them is very generally connected with a censurable abuse. This case will comprehend music, as practised at the present day; because they believe it to be injurious to health, to occasion a waste of time, to create an emulative disposition, and to give an undue indulgence to sensual feelings.

And as the Quakers conceive this species of argument to be tenable in Christian morals, so they hold it to be absolutely necessary to be adopted in the education of youth. For grown-up persons may have sufficient judgment to distinguish between the use of a thing and its abuse. They may discern the boundaries of each, and enjoy the one while they avoid the other. But youth have no such power of discrimination. Like inexperienced mariners, they know not where to look for the deep and the shallow water; and, allured by enchanting circumstances, they may, like those who are reported to have been enticed by the voices of the fabulous syrens, easily overlook the danger that too frequently awaits them in their course.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.

The theatre—The theatre as well as music abused—Plays respectable in their origin; but degenerated—Solon, Plato, and the ancient moralists, against them—Particularly immoral in England in the time of Charles the Second—Forbidden by George Fox—Sentiments of Archbishop Tillotson—of William Law—English Plays better than formerly; but still objectionable—Prohibition of George Fox continued by the Quakers.

It is much to be lamented that customs, which originated in respectable motives, and which might have been made productive of innocent pleasure, should have been so perverted in time, that the continuation of them should be considered as a grievance by moral men. As we have seen this to be the case, in some measure, with respect to music, so it is the case with respect to plays.

Dramatic compositions appear to have had no reprehensible origin. It certainly was an object with the authors of some of the earliest plays to combine the entertainment with the moral improvement of the mind. Tragedy was at first simply a monody to Bacchus. But the tragedy of the ancients, from which the modern is derived, did not arise in the world till the dialogue and the chorus were introduced. Now the chorus, as every scholar knows, was a moral office. They who filled it were loud in their recommendations of justice and temperance. They inculcated a religious observance of the laws. They implored punishment on the abandoned. They were strenuous in their discouragement of vice, and in their promotion of virtue. This office, therefore, being coæval with tragedy itself, preserves it from the charge of an immoral origin.

Nor was comedy, which took its rise afterwards, the result of corrupt motives. In the most ancient comedies we find it to have been the great object of the writers to attack vice. If a chief citizen had acted inconsistently with his character, he was ridiculed upon the stage. His very name was not concealed on the occasion. In the course of time, however, the writers of dramatic pieces were forbidden to use the names of the persons, whom they proposed to censure. But we find them still adhering to the same great object,—the exposure of vice; and they painted the vicious character frequently so well, that the person was soon discovered by the audience, though disguised by a fictitious name. When new restrictions were afterwards imposed upon the writers of such pieces, they produced a new species of comedy. This is that which obtains at the present day. It consisted of an imitation of the manners of common life. The

subject, the names, and the characters belonging to it, were now all of them feigned. Writers, however, retained their old object of laughing at folly and of exposing vice.

Thus it appears that the theatre, as far as tragedy was employed, inculcated frequently as good lessons of morality as heathenism could produce; and, as far as comedy was concerned, that it became often the next remedy, after the more grave and moral lectures of the ancient philosophers, against the prevailing excesses of the times.

But though the theatre professed to encourage virtue and to censure vice, yet such a combination of injurious effects was interwoven with the representations there, arising either from the influence of fiction upon morals, or from the sight of the degradation of the rational character by buffoonery, or from the tendency of such representations to produce levity and dissipation, or from various other causes, that they, who were the greatest lovers of virtue in those days, and the most solicitous of improving the moral condition of man, began to consider them as productive of much more evil than of good. Solon forewarned Thespis that the effects of such plays as he saw him act would become in time injurious to the morals of mankind; and he forbade him to act again. The Athenians, though such performances were afterwards allowed, would never permit any of their judges to compose a comedy. The Spartans under Lycurgus, who were the most virtuous of all the people of Greece, would not suffer either tragedies or comedies to be acted at all. Plato, as he had banished music, so he banished theatrical exhibitions from his pure republic. Seneca considered that vice made insensible approaches by means of the stage, and that it stole on the people in the disguise of pleasure. The Romans, in their purer times, considered the stage to be so disgraceful, that every Roman was to be degraded who became an actor; and so pernicious to morals, that they put it under the power of a censor to control its efforts.

But the stage in the time of Charles the Second, when the Quakers first appeared in the world, was in a worse state than even in the Grecian or Roman times. If there was ever a period in any country when it was noted as the school of profligate and corrupt morals, it was in this reign. George Fox, therefore, as a Christian reformer, could not be supposed to be behind the heathen philosophers in a case where morality was concerned. Accordingly we find him protesting publicly against all such spectacles. In this protest he was joined by Robert Barclay and William Penn, two of the greatest men of those times, who in their respective publications attacked them with great spirit. These publications showed the

sentiments of the Quakers, as a religious body, upon this subject. It was understood that no Quaker could be present at amusements of this sort. And this idea was confirmed by the sentiments and advices of several of the most religious members, which were delivered on public occasions. By means of these publications and advices the subject was kept alive, till it became at length incorporated into the religious discipline of the Society. The theatre was then specifically forbidden; and an inquiry was annually to be made from thenceforward, whether any of the members of it had been found violating the prohibition.

Since the time of Charles the Second, when George Fox entered his protest against exhibitions of this sort, it must certainly be confessed that an alteration has taken place for the better in the constitution of our plays, and that poison is not diffused into morals by means of them, to an equal extent, as at that period. The mischief has been considerably circumscribed by legal inspection, and, it is to be hoped, by the improved civilization of the times. But it does not appear, by any historical testimony we have, that a change has been made which is at all proportioned to the quantity of moral light, which has been diffused among us since that reign. Archbishop Tillotson was of opinion "that plays might be so framed, and they might be governed by such rules, as not only to be innocently diverting, but instructive and useful, to put some follies and vices out of countenance, which could not, perhaps, be so decently reproved, nor so effectually exposed or corrected any other way." And yet he confesses that "they were so full of profaneness, and that they instilled such bad principles into the mind, in his own day, that they ought not to have been tolerated in any civilized, and much less in a Christian nation." William Law, an eminent divine of the establishment, who lived after Tillotson, declared, in one of his publications on the subject of the stage, that "you could not then see a play in either house but what abounded with thoughts, passages, and language, contrary to the Christian religion." From the time of William Law to the present about forty years have elapsed, and we do not see, if we consult the controversial writers on the subject who live among us, that the theatre has become much less objectionable since those days. Indeed, if the names only of our modern plays were to be collected and published, they would teach us to augur very unfavorably as to the morality of their contents. The Quakers, therefore, as a religious body, have seen no reason why they should differ in opinion from their ancestors on this subject: and hence the prohibition, which began in former times with respect to the theatre, is continued by them at the present day.

SECTION II.

Theatre forbidden by the Quakers on account of the manner of the drama; first as it personates the characters of others; secondly, as it professes to reform vice.

The Quakers have many reasons to give, why, as a Society of Christians, they cannot encourage the theater by being present at any of its exhibitions. I shall not detail all of them for the reader, but shall select such as I think most material to the point.

The first class of arguments comprehends such as relate to what may be called the Manner of the Drama.

They object to the manner of the drama, or to its fictitious nature, in consequence of which men personate characters that are not their own. This personification they hold to be injurious to the man who is compelled to practise it. Not that he will partake of the bad passions which he personates, but that the trick and trade of representing, what he does not feel, must make him at all times an actor; and his looks, and words, and actions, will be all sophisticated. And this evil will be likely to continue with him in the various changes of his life.

They hold it also to be contrary to the spirit of Christianity. For men, who personate characters in this way, express joy and grief, when in reality there may be none of these feelings in their hearts. They express noble sentiments, when their whole lives may have been remarkable for their meanness, and go often afterwards and wallow in sensual delights. They personate the virtuous character to-day, and perhaps to-morrow that of the rake. And, in the the latter case, they utter his profligate sentiments, and speak his profane language. Now Christianity requires simplicity and truth. It allows no man to pretend to be what he is not. And it requires great circumspection of its followers with respect to what they may utter, because it makes every man accountable for his idle words.

The Quakers, therefore, are of opinion that they cannot, as men either professing Christian tenets or Christian love, encourage others to assume false characters, or to personate those which are not their own*.

---

* Rousseau condemns the stage upon the same principle. "It is," says he, "the art of dissimulation; of assuming a foreign character, and of appearing differently from what a man really is; of flying into a passion without a cause, and of saying what he does not think as naturally as if he really did: in a word, of forgetting himself, to personate others."

They object also to the manner of the drama, even where it professes to be a school for morals. For where it teaches morality, it inculcates rather the loose virtue of heathenism than the strict though mild discipline of the gospel: and where it attempts to extirpate vice, it does it rather by making it ridiculous, than by making men shun it for the love of virtue. It no where fixes the deep Christian principle, by which men are bound to avoid it as sin, but places the propriety of the dereliction of it rather upon the loss of reputation among the world than upon any sense of religious duty.

SECTION III.

Theatre forbidden on account of the internal contents of the drama; both of those of tragedy and of comedy—These contents hold out false morals and prospects, and weaken the sinews of morality—Observations of Lord Kaimes upon the subject.

The next class of arguments is taken from the Internal Contents of the Drama.

The Quakers mean that dramatic compositions generally contain false sentiments; that is, such as Christianity would disapprove; that of course they hold out false prospects; that they inculcate false morals; and that they have a tendency, from these and other of their internal contents, to promote dissipation, and to weaken the sinews of morality in those who see them represented upon the stage.

Tragedy is considered by the Quakers as a part of the drama, where the hero is generally a warrior, and where a portion of human happiness is made to consist of martial glory. Hence it is considered as frequently inculcating proud and lofty sentiments, as cherishing a fierce and romantic spirit, as encouraging rival enmities, as holding of no importance the bond of love and union between man and man. Now as Christianity enjoins humility, peace, quietness, brotherly affection, and charity, which latter is not to be bounded by the limits of any country, the Quakers hold, as a Christian body, that they cannot admit their children to spectacles which have a tendency to engender a disposition opposite to these.

Comedy is considered as holding out prospects and inculcating morals equally false and hurtful. In such compositions, for example, a bad impression is not uniformly given of a bad character. Knavery frequently accomplishes its ends without the merited punishment. Indeed treachery and intrigue are often considered but as jocose occurrences. The laws of modern honor are frequently held out to the spectator as laws that are to influence in life. Vulgar expressions, and even swearing, are admitted upon the stage.

Neither is chastity nor delicacy always consulted there. Impure allusions are frequently interwoven into the dialogue, so that innocence cannot but often blush. Incidents not very favorable to morals are sometimes introduced. New dissipated characters are produced to view, by the knowledge of which the novice in dissipation is not diverted from his new and baneful career, but finds only his scope of dissipation enlarged, and a wider field to range in. To these hurtful views of things, as arising from the internal structure, are to be added those which arise from the extravagant love-tales, the ridiculous intrigues, and the silly buffoonery, of the compositions of the stage.

Now it is impossible, the Quakers contend, that these ingredients, which are the component parts of comic amusements, should not have an injurious influence upon the mind that is young and tender, and susceptible of impressions. If the blush, which started upon the cheek of a young person on the first hearing of an indecorous or profane sentiment, and continued for some time to be excited at repetitions of the same, should at length be so effectually suppressed, that the impudent language of ribaldry can revive it no more, it is clear that a victory will have been gained over his moral feelings. And if he should remember (and what is to hinder him when the occurrances of the stage are marked with strong action and accompanied with impressive scenery) the language, the sentiments, the incidents, the prospects, which dramatic pieces have brought before him, he may combine these, as they rise to memory, with his own feelings, and incorporate them imperceptibly into the habits and manners of his own life. Thus if vice be not represented as odious, he may lose his love of virtue. If buffoonery should be made to please him, he may lose the dignity of his mind. Love-tales may produce in him a romantic imagination. Low characters may teach him low cunning. If the laws of honor strike him as the laws of refined life, he may become a fashionable moralist. If modes of dissipation strike him as modes of pleasure in the estimation of the world, he may abandon himself to these and become a rake. Thus may such representations, in a variety of ways, act upon the moral principle, and make an innovation there detrimental to his moral character.

Lord Kaimes, in his Elements of Criticism, has the following observations.

"The licentious court of Charles the Second, among its many disorders, engendered a pest, the virulence of which subsists to this day. The English comedy, copying the manners of the court, became abominably licentious; and continues so with very little softening. It is there an established rule to deck out the chief charac-

ters with every vice in fashion, however gross; but as such characters, if viewed in a true light, would be disgustful, care is taken to disguise their deformity under the embellishments of wit, sprightliness, and good-humor, which in mixed company makes a capital figure. It requires not much thought to discover the poisonous influence of such plays. A young man of figure, emancipated at last from the severity and restraint of a college education, repairs to the capital, disposed to every sort of excess. The playhouse becomes his favorite amusement, and he is enchanted with the gaiety and splendor of the chief personages. The disgust, which vice gave him at first, soon wears off, to make way for new notions, more liberal, in his opinion, by which a sovreign contempt of religion, and a declared war upon the chastity of wives, maids and widows, are converted from being infamous vices to be fashionable virtues. The infection spreads gradually through all ranks, and becomes universal. How gladly would I listen to any one who should undertake to prove that what I have been describing is chimerical! But the dissoluteness of our young men of birth will not suffer me to doubt its reality. Sir Harry Wildair has completed many a rake; and, in the Suspicious Husband, Ranger, the humble imitator of Sir Harry, has had no slight influence in spreading that character. What woman, tinctured with the playhouse morals, would not be the sprightly, the witty, though dissolute, Lady Townley, rather than the cold, the sober, though virtuous, Lady Grace? How odious ought writers to be, who thus employ the talents they have from their Maker most traitorously against himself, by endeavoring to corrupt and disfigure his creatures! If the comedies of Congreve did not rack him with remorse in his last moments, he must have been lost to all sense of virtue."

SECTION IV.

The theatre forbidden, because injurious to the happiness of man by disqualifying him for the pleasures of religion—This effect arises from its tendency to accustom individuals to light thoughts—to injure their moral feelings—to occasion an extraordinary excitement of the mind—and from the very nature of the enjoyments, which it produces.

As the Quakers consider the theatre to have an injurious effect on the morality of man, so they consider it to have an injurious effect on his happiness. They believe that amusements of this sort, but particularly the comic, unfit the mind for the practical performance of the Christian duties; and that as the most pure and substantial happiness that man can experience is derived from fulfilling these,

so they deprive him of the highest enjoyments of which his nature is capable—that is, of the pleasures of religion.

Were a man asked, on entering the door of the theatre, if he went there to learn the moral duties, he would laugh at the absurdity of the question; and, if he would consent to give a fair and direct answer, he would either reply that he went there for his amusement, or to dissipate gloom, or to be made merry; some one of these expressions would probably characterize his errand there. Now this answer would comprise the effect, which the Quakers attach to the comic performances of the stage. They consider them as drawing the mind from serious reflection, and disposing it to levity. But they believe that a mind, gradually accustomed to light thoughts, and placing its gratification in light objects, must be disqualified in time for the gravity of religious exercise, and be thus hindered from partaking the pleasures which such an exercise must produce.

They are of opinion, also, that such exhibitions having, as was lately mentioned, a tendency to weaken the moral character, must have a similarly injurious effect. For what innovations can be made on the human heart, so as to seduce it from innocence, that will not successively wean it both from the love and the enjoyment of the Christian virtues?

They believe also that dramatic exhibitions have a power of vast excitement of the mind. If they have no such power, they are insipid. If they have, they are injurious. A person is all the evening at a play in an excited state. He comes home and goes to bed with his imagination heated and his passions roused. The next morning he rises: he remembers what he has seen and heard,—the scenery, the language, the sentiments, the action. He continues in the same excited state for the remainder of the day. The extravagant passions of distracted lovers, the wanton addresses of actors, are still fresh upon his mind. Now it is contended by the Quakers, that a person in such an excited state, but particularly if the excitement pleases, must be in a very unfavorable condition for the reception of the pure principle, or for the promotion of the practical duties of religion. It is supposed that if any religious book, or if any parts of the sacred writings, were handed to him in these moments, he would be incapable of enjoying them; and, of course, that religious retirement, which implies an abstraction from the things of the world, would be impracticable at such a season.

They believe also, that the exhibitions of the drama must, from their own nature, without any other consideration, disqualify for the pleasures of religion. It was a frequent saying of George Fox (taken from the apostle Peter), that "they who indulged in such

pleasures were dead while they were alive;" that is, they were active in their bodies; they ran about briskly after their business or their pleasures; they showed the life of their bodily powers; but they were extinct as to spiritual feeling. By this he meant, that the pleasures of the theatre, and others of a similar nature, were in direct opposition to the pleasures of religion. The former were from the world, worldly. They were invented according to the disposition and appetites of men. But the latter were from the spirit, spiritual. Hence there was not a greater difference between life and death than between these pleasures. Hence the human mind was made incapable of receiving both at the same time; and hence, the deeper it were to get into the enjoyment of the former, the less qualified it would become of course for the enjoyment of the latter.

SECTION V.

Theatre forbidden, because injurious to the happiness of man by disqualifying him for domestic enjoyments—Quakers value these next to the pleasures of religion—Sentiments of Cowper—Theatre has this tendency, by weaning gradually from a love of home—and has it in a greater degree than any other of the amusements of the world.

The Quakers, ever since the institution of their Society, have abandoned the diversions of the world. They have obtained their pleasures from other quarters. Some of these they have found in one species of enjoyment, and others in another. But those which they particularly prize, they have found in the enjoyment of domestic happiness. And these pleasures they value next to the pleasures of religion.

"Domestic Happiness, thou only bliss
Of paradise that has surviv'd the fall!
Thou art the nurse of virtue.—In thine arms
She smiles appearing, as in truth she is,
Heav'n-born, and destin'd to the skies again.
Thou art not known where Pleasure is ador'd.—
That reeling goddess, with a zoneless waist
And wand'ring eyes, still leaning on the arm
Of Novelty, her fickle, frail support;
For thou art meek and constant, hating change,
And finding, in the calm of truth-tried love,
Joys that her stormy raptures never yield.
Forsaking thee, what shipwreck have we made
Of honor, dignity, and fair renown!" COWPER.

But if the Quakers have been accustomed to place one of the sources of their pleasures in domestic happiness, they may be sup-

posed to be jealous of everything that appears to them to be likely to interrupt it. But they consider dramatic exhibitions as having this tendency. These exhibitions, under the influence of plot, dialogue, dress, music, action, and scenery, particularly fascinate. They excite the person, who has once seen them, to desire them again. But in proportion as this desire is gratified, or in proportion as people leave their homes for the amusements of the stage, they lose their relish and weaken their powers of the enjoyment of domestic society; that is, the Quakers mean to say, that domestic enjoyments and those of the theatre may become in time incompatible in the same persons; and that the theatre ought therefore to be particularly avoided, as an enemy that may steal upon them and rob them of those pleasures, which experience has taught them to value, as I have observed before, next to the pleasures of religion.

They are of opinion, also, that dramatic exhibitions not only tend of themselves to make home less agreeable, but that they excite a craving for stimulants; and, above all, teach a dependence upon external objects for amusement. Hence the attention of people is taken off again to new objects of pleasure, which lie out of their own families and out of the circle of their friends.

It will not occupy much time to show that the Quakers have not been mistaken on this point.

It is not unusual in fashionable circles, where the theatre is regularly brought into the rounds of pleasure, for the father and the mother of a family to go to a play once, or occasionally twice, a week. But it seldom happens that they either go to the same theatre, or that they sit together. Their children are at this time left at home under what is considered to be proper care; but they are probably never seen again by them till the next noon, and perhaps once afterwards in the same day, when it is more than an even chance that they must be left again for the gratification of some new pleasure. Now this separation of fathers from mothers, and of parents from children, does not augur well of domestic enjoyments or of a love of home.

But we will trace the conduct of the parents still further. We will get into their company at their own houses: and here we shall very soon discover, how wearisome they consider every hour that is spent in the bosom of their families, when deprived of their accustomed amusements; and with what anxiety they count the time till they are restored to their favorite rounds of pleasure.

We shall find no difficulty in judging also, from their conversation, the measure of their thought or their solicitude about their children. A new play is sure to claim the earliest attention or discussion.

The capital style, in which an actor performed his part on a certain night, furnishes conversation for an hour. Observations on a new actress perhaps follow. Such subjects appear more interesting to such persons than the innocent conversation or the playful pranks of their children. If the latter are noisy, they are often sent out of the room as troublesome, though the same parents can bear the stunning plaudits or the discordant groans and hissings of the audience at the theatre.

In the mean time their children grow up, and, in their turn, are introduced by their parents to these amusements, as to places proper for the dissipation of vacant hours; till by frequent attendance they themselves lose an affection for home and the domestic duties, and have in time as little regard for their parents, as their parents appear to have for them. Marrying at length, not for the enjoyment of domestic society, they and their children perpetuate the same rounds of pleasure, and the same sentiments and notions.

To these instances many indeed might be added, by looking into the family histories of those, who are in the habit of frequenting theatres in search of pleasure, by which it would appear that such amusements are not friendly to the cherishing of the domestic duties and affections, but that, on the other hand, in proportion as they are followed, they tend to sap the enjoyments of domestic life. And here it may be observed that, of all the amusements which go to the making up of the round of pleasures, the theatre has the greatest share in diverting from the pleasures of home: for it particularly attracts and fascinates both from the nature and the diversity of the amusements which it contains. It is also always open, in the season, for resort. So that if private invitations to pleasure should not come in sufficiently numerous, or should be broken off by the indisposition of the parties who give them, the theater is always ready to supply any vacancy that may be occasioned in the round.

SECTION VI.

Quakers conceive that they can sanction no amusements but such as could have originated in Christian minds—Exhibitions of the drama could have had, they believe, no such origin—Early Christians abandoned them on their conversion—Arguments of the latter on this subject, as taken from Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Lactantius, and others.

The Quakers conceive, as a Christian Society, that they ought to have nothing to do with any amusements but such as Christians could have invented themselves, or such as Christians could have sanctioned by becoming partakers of them. But they believe that

dramatic exhibitions are of such a nature, as men of a Christian spirit could never have invented or encouraged; and that, if the world were to begin again, and were to be peopled by pure Christians, these exhibitions could never be called into existence there.

This inference they judge to be deducible from the nature of a Christian mind. A man, who is in the habit at his leisure hours of looking into the vast and stupendous works of creation, of contemplating the wisdom, goodness, and power of the Creator, of trying to fathom the great and magnificent plans of his providence; who is in the habit of surveying all mankind with the philosophy of revealed religion, of tracing through the same unerring channel the uses and objects of their existence, the design of their different ranks and situations, the nature of their relative duties, and the like, could never, in the opinion of the Quakers, have either any enjoyment, or be concerned in the invention, of dramatic exhibitions. To a mind, in the habit of taking such an elevated flight, it is supposed that every thing on the stage must look little and childish, and out of place. How could a person of such a mind be delighted with the musical note of a fiddler, the attitude of a dancer, the impassioned grimace of an actor? How could the intrigue, or the love-sick tale, of the composition please him? Or how could he have imagined that these could be the component parts of a Christian's joys?

But this inference is considered by the Society to be confirmed by the practice of the early Christians. These generally had been pagans. They had of course pagan dispositions. They followed pagan amusements; and, among these, the exhibitions of the stage. But soon after their conversion, that is when they had received new minds, and when they had exercised these on new and sublime subjects, or on subjects similar to those described,—or, in other words, when they had received the regenerated spirit of Christians,—they left the amusements of the stage, notwithstanding that, by this act of singularity in a sensual age, they were likely to bring upon themselves the odium and the reproaches of the world.

But when the early Christians abandoned the theatre, they abandoned it, as the Quakers contend, not because leaving paganism they were to relinquish all customs that were pagan, but because they saw in their new religion, or because they saw in this newness of their minds, reasons which held out such amusements to be inadmissible while they considered themselves in the light of Christians. These reasons are sufficiently displayed by the writers of the second, third, and fourth centuries; and as they are alluded to by the Quakers, though never quoted, I shall give them to the reader. He will judge by these how far the ancient coincide with the modern Christians

upon this subject; and how far these arguments of antiquity are applicable to modern times.

The early Christians, according to Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian, Lactantius, and others, believed that the motives for going to these amusements were not of the purest sort. People went to them without any view of the improvement of their minds. "The motive was either to see, or to be seen."

They considered the manner of the drama as objectionable. They believed "that he, who was the author of truth, could never approve of that which was false, and that he, who condemned hypocrisy, could never approve of him who personated the characters of others; and that they, therefore, who pretended to be in love, or to be angry, or to grieve, when none of those passions existed in their minds, were guilty of a kind of adultery in the eyes of the supreme Being."

They considered their contents to be noxious. They looked upon them "as consistories of immorality. They affirmed that things were spoken there which it did not become Christians to hear; and that things were shown there which it did not become Christians to see; and that while these things polluted those from whom they came, they polluted those in time, in whose sight and hearing they were either shown or spoken."

They believed also that these thing "not only polluted the spectators, but that the representations of certain characters upon the stage pointed out to them the various roads to vice, and inclined them to become the persons whom they had seen represented, or to be actors in reality of what they had seen feigned upon the stage."

They believed, again, that dramatic exhibitions "produced a frame of mind contrary to that which should exist in a Christian breast: that there was nothing to be seen upon the stage that could lead or encourage him to devotion; but, on the other hand, that the noise and fury of the playhouse, and the representations there, produced a state of excitement that disturbed the internal man. Whereas the spirit of a Christian ought to be calm, and quiet, and composed, to fit it for the duties of religion."

They believed also, that "such promiscuous assemblages of men and women were unfavorable to virtue, for that the sparks of the passions were there blown into flames."

Tertullian, from whom some of the above opinions are taken, gives an invitation to those, who were fond of public spectacles, in nearly the following terms:

"Are you fond," says he, "of the scenic doctrine, or of theatrical sights and compositions? We have plenty of books for you to read. We can give you works in prose and in verse. We can give you

apopthegms and hymns. We cannot, to be sure, give you fictitious plots or fables, but we can give you truths. We cannot give you strophes or the winding dances of the chorus, but we can give you simplicities, or plain and straight-forward paths. Are you fond of seeing contests for victory? You shall see these also, and such as are not trivial, but important. You may see, in our Christian example, chastity overcoming immodesty. You may see faithfulness giving a death-wound to perfidy. You may see mercy getting the better of cruelty. You may see modesty and delicacy of sentiment overcoming impurity and impudence. These are the contests, in which it becomes us Christians to be concerned, and where we ought to endeavor to receive the prize."

CHAPTER V.

SECTION I.

Dancing—Dancing forbidden—Greeks and Romans differed on this subject—Motives on which the Greeks encourage dancing—Motive on which the moderns encourage it—Way in which the Quakers view it—Arguments which they use against it.

As the Quakers have thought it right to prohibit music and stage entertainments to the Society, so they have thought it proper to prohibit dancing; none of their children being allowed any instruction in the latter art.

It is remarkable that two of the most civilized nations, as well as the two wisest men of antiquity, should have differed in their opinion with respect to dancing. The Greeks considered it as an useful and an honorable employment; and most of the nations, therefore, under that appellation inserted it into their system of education. The name of dancer was so honorable as to be given to some of their gods. Statues are recorded to have been erected to good dancers. Socrates is said to have admired dancing so much, as to have learnt it in his old age. Dancing, on the other hand, was but little regarded at Rome. It was not admitted even within the pale of accomplishments. It was considered at best but as a sorry and trivial employment. Cicero says, "Nemo fere saltat sobrius, nisi, forte insanit, neque in solitudine, neque in convivio honesto."—"No man dances, in private, or at any respectable entertainment, except he be drunk or mad."

We collect, at least, from the above statement, that people of old, who were celebrated for their wisdom, came to very different conclusions with respect to the propriety of encouraging this art.

Those nations among the ancients, which encouraged dancing, did it upon the principle that it led to an agility of body, and a quickness of motion, that would be useful in military evolutions and exploits. Hence "swift of foot" was considered to be an epithet as honorable as any that could be given to a warrior.

The moderns, on the other hand, encourage dancing, or at least defend it, upon rather different principles. They consider it as producing a handsome carriage of the body, as leading to a graceful and harmonious use of the limbs, and as begetting an erectness of position not more favorable to the look of a person than to his health.

That dancing produces dispositions of this sort cannot be denied, though certainly not to the extent which many have imagined. Painters, who study nature the most, and are the best judges of the appearance of the human frame, are of opinion that modern dancing does not produce natural figures, or at least such as they would choose for their respective compositions. The military exercise has quite a great share of dancing, in the production of these dispositions. And there are certainly men who were never taught either the military exercise or dancing, whose deportment is harmonious and graceful.

The Quakers think it unnecessary to teach their children dancing, as an accomplishment, because they can walk and carry their persons with sufficient ease and propriety without it.

They think it unnecessary also, because, how consistent soever the practice of it may be with the sprightliness of youth, they could never sanction it in maturer age. They expect of the members of their Society that they should abandon amusements, and substitute useful and dignified pursuits, when they become men. But they cannot consider dancing otherwise than as an employment that is useless, and below the dignity of the Christian character, in persons who have come to years of discretion. To initiate, therefore, a youth of twelve or thirteen years of age into dancing, when he must relinquish it at twenty, would, in their opinion, be a culpable waste of his time.

The Quakers cannot view dancing abstractedly, for no person teaches or practices it abstractedly; but they are obliged to view it in connection with other things. If they view it with its usual accompaniment of music, it would be inconsistent, they think to encourage it, when they have banished music from their society. If

they view it as connected with an assemblage of persons, they must, they conceive, equally condemn it. And here it is, in fact, that they principally level their arguments against it. They prohibit all members of their Society from being present at balls and assemblies; and they think if their youth are brought up in ignorance of the art of dancing, this ignorance will operate as one preventative at least against their attending amusements of this nature.

The Quakers are as strict in their inquiry with respect to the attendance of any of their members at balls, as at theatrical amusements. They consider balls and assemblies among the vain amusements of the world. They use arguments against these, nearly similar to those, which have been enumerated on the preceding subjects. They consider them, in the first place, as productive of a kind of frivolous levity and of thoughtlesness with respect to the important duties of life. They consider them, in the second place, as giving birth to vanity and pride. They consider them, again, as powerful in the excitement of some of the malevolent passions. Hence they believe them to be injurious to the religious interests of a man. For, by depriving him of complacency of mind, and by increasing growth of his bad feeling, they become impediments in the way of his improvement as a moral being.

SECTION II.

Arguments of the Quakers examined—Three cases made out for the determination of a moral philosopher—Case the first—Case the second—Case the third.

I purpose to look into these arguments of the Society, and to see how far they can be supported. I will suppose, therefore, a few cases to be made up, and to be handed one by one, to some moral philosopher for his decision. I will suppose, this philosopher (that all prejudice of education may be excluded) to have been previously ignorant of the nature of dancing, but to have been made acquainted with it in order that he might be enabled to decide on the point in question.

Suppose, then, it was reported to this philosopher, that on a certain day a number of young persons of both sexes, who had casually met at a friend's house, instead of confining themselves to the room on a summer's afternoon, had walked out upon the green; that a person present had invited them suddenly to dance; that they had danced to the sound of musical vibrations for an hour; and that after this they had returned to the room, or that they had returned home. Would the philosopher be able to say, in this case, that there was any

thing in it, that incurred any of the culpable imputations fixed upon dancing by the Quakers?

He could hardly, I think, make it out that there could have been, in any part of the business, any opening for the charges in question. There appear to have been no previous preparations of extravagant dressing; no premeditated design of setting off the person; no previous methods of procuring admiration; no circumstance, in short, by which he could reasonably suppose that either pride or vanity could have been called into existence. The time also would appear to him to have been too short, and the circumstances too limited, to have given birth to improper feelings. He would certainly see that a sort of levity would have unavoidably arisen on the occasion, but his impartiality and justice would oblige him to make a distinction between the levity that only exhilarates, and the levity that corrupts the heart. Nor could he conceive that the dancing for an hour only, and this totally unlooked for, could stand much in the way of serious reflection for the future. If he were desired to class this sudden dancing for an hour upon the green with any of the known pleasures of life, he would probably class it with an hour's exercise in the fields, or with an hour's game at play, or with an hour's employment in some innocent recreation.

But suppose, now, that a new case were opened to the philosopher. Suppose it were told him, that the same party had been so delighted with their dance upon the green, that they had resolved to meet once a month for the purpose of dancing, and, that they might not be prevented by bad weather, to meet in a public room; that they had met according to their resolution; that they had danced at their first meeting but for a short time; but that at their meetings afterwards they had got into the habit of dancing from eight or nine at night till twelve or one in the morning; that many of them now began to be unduly heated in the course of this long exercise; that some of them, in consequence of the heat in this crowded room, were now occasionally ready to faint; that it was now usual for some of them to complain the next morning of colds, others of head-aches, others of relaxed nerves, and almost all of them of a general lassitude or weariness:—What would the philosopher say in the present case?

The philosopher would now probably think that they acted unreasonably as human beings; that they turned night into day; and that, as if the evils of life were not sufficient in number, they converted hours, which might have been spent calmly and comfortably at home, into hours of indisposition and of unpleasant feeling to themselves. But this is not to the point. Would he or would he not say that the arguments of the Quakers applied in the present case?

It certainly does not appear, from any thing that has yet transpired on this subject, that he could, with any shadow of reason, accuse the persons meeting on this occasion of vanity or pride, or that he could see from any of the occurrences that have been mentioned how these evils could be produced. Neither has any thing yet come out, from which he could even imagine the sources of any improper passions. He might think, perhaps, that they might be vexed for having brought fatigue and lassitude upon themselves; but he could see no opening for serious anger to others, or for any of the feelings of malevolence. Neither could he tell what occurrence to fix upon for the production of a frivolous levity. He would almost question, judging only from what has appeared in the last case, whether there might not be upon the whole more pain than pleasure from these meetings; and whether they, who on the day subsequent to these meetings felt themselves indisposed and their whole nervous system unbraced, were not so near the door of repentance, that serious thoughts would be more natural to them than those of a lighter kind.

But let us suppose one other case to be opened to the philosopher. Let us suppose it to be now stated to him that those, who frequent these monthly meetings, but particularly the females, had become habituated to talk for a day or two beforehand of nothing but of how they should dress themselves, or of what they should wear on the occasion; that some time had been spent in examining and canvassing the fashions; that the milliner had been called in for this purpose; that the imagination had been racked in the study of the decoration of the person; that both on the morning and the afternoon of the evening, on which they had publicly met to dance, they had been solely employed in preparations for decking themselves out; that they had been nearly two hours under one dresser only, namely, the hair dresser; that frequently at intervals they had looked at their own persons in the glass; that they had walked up and down parading before it in admiration of their own appearance, and in the critical detection of any little fold in their dress which might appear to be out of place, and in the adjustment of the same:—What would the philosopher say in this new case?

He certainly could not view the case with the same complacent countenance as before. He would feel some symptoms of alarm. He would begin to think that the truth of the Quaker arguments was unfolding itself, and that what appeared to him to be an innocent amusement at the first, might possibly be capable of being carried out of the bounds of innocence by such and similar accompaniments. He could not conceive, if he had any accurate knowledge of the human heart, that such an extraordinary attention to dress and to the

decoration of the person, or such a critical examination of these with a view of procuring admiration, could produce any other fruits than conceit and affectation, or vanity and pride. Nor could he conceive that all these preperations, all this previous talk, all this previous consultation about the fashions, added to the employment itself of the decoration of the person, could tend to anything else than to degrade the mind and to render it light and frivolous. He would be obliged to acknowledge also, that minds, accustomed to take so deep an interest in the fashions and vanities of the world, would not only loathe, but be disqualified for, serious reflection. But if he were to acknowledge that these preparations and accompaniments had, on any one occasion, a natural tendency to produce these effects, he could not but consider these preparations, if made once a month, as likely to become in time systematic nurseries for frivolous and affected characters.

Having traced the subject up to a point, where it appears that some of the Quaker arguments begin to bear, let us take leave of our philosopher; and as we have advanced nearly to the ball-room door, let us enter into the room itself, and see if any circumstances occur there, which shall enable us to form a better judgment upon it.

SECTION III.

Arguments of the Quakers still further examined—Interior of the ball-room displayed—View of the rise of many of the malevolent passions—these rise higher and are more painful than they are generally imagined—hence it is probable that spectators are better pleased than those interested in these dances—Conclusion of the arguments of the Quakers on this subject.

I am afraid that I shall be thought more cynical than just, more prejudiced than impartial, more given to censure than to praise, if, in temples apparently dedicated to good-humor, cheerfulness, and mirth, I should say that sources were to be found from whence we could trace the rise of immoral passions. But human nature is alike in all places; and if circumstances should arise in the ball-room which touch as it were, the strings of the passions, they will as naturally throw out their tone there as in other places. Why should envy, jealousy, pride, malice, anger, or revenge, shut themselves out exclusively from these resorts, as if these were more than ordinarily sacred, or more than ordinary repositories of human worth?

In examining the interior of the ball-room, it must be confessed that we shall certainly find circumstances occasionally arising, that give birth to feelings neither of a pleasant nor of a moral nature. It is not unusual, for instance, to discover among the females one that excels in the beauty of her person, and another that excels in

the elegance of her dress. The eyes of all are more than proportionally turned upon these for the whole night. This little circumstance soon generates a variety of improper passions. It calls up vanity and conceit in the breasts of these objects of admiration. It raises envy and jealousy, and even anger in some of the rest. These become envious of the beauty of the former, envious of their taste, envious of their clothing, and, above all, jealous of the admiration bestowed upon them. In this evil state of mind one passion begets another; and instances have occurred, where some of these have felt displeased at the apparent coldness and indifferance of their own partners, because they have appeared to turn their eyes more upon the favorites of the night than upon themselves.

In the same room, when the parties begin to take their places to dance, other little circumstances not unfrequently occur, which give rise to other passions. Many, aiming to be as near the top of the dance as possible, are disappointed of their places by others who have just stepped into them. Dissatisfaction, and sometimes murmurs follow. Each, in his own mind, supposes his claims and pretensions to the higher place to be stronger, on account of his money, his connections, his profession, or his rank. Thus, his own dispositions to pride are only the more nursed and fostered. Malice, too, is often engendered on the occasion: and though the parties would not be allowed by the master of the ceremonies to disturb the tranquility of the room, animosities have sometimes sprung up between them which have not been healed in a little time. I am aware that in some large towns of the kingdom regulations are made with a view to the prevention of these evils, but it is in some only; and even where they are made, though they prevent outward rude behavior, they do not prevent inward dissatisfaction. Moneyed influence still feels itself often debased by a lower place.

If we were to examine the ball-room further, we should find new circumstances arising to call out new and degrading passions. We should find disappointment and discontent often throwing the seeds of irritability on the mind. Men, fond of dancing, frequently find an over-proportion of men, and but few females, in the room. And women, wishing to dance, sometimes find an over-proportion of women, and but few men; so that partners are not to be had for all, and a number of each class must make up their minds to sit quietly, and to loose their diversion for the night. Partners, too, are frequently dissatisfied with each other. One thinks his partner too old; another too plain; another below him. Matched often in this unequal manner, they go down the dance in a sort of dudgeon, having no cordial disposition toward each other, and having persons before

their eyes in the same room with whom they could have cordially danced. Nor are instances wanting where the pride of some has fixed upon the mediocrity of others, as a reason why they should reluctantly lend them their hands when falling in with them in the dance. The slight is soon perceived, and disgust arises in both parties.

Various other instances might be mentioned where very improper passions are excited. I shall only observe, however, that these passions are generally stronger, and give more uneasiness, and are called up to a greater height, than might generally be imagined from such apparently slight causes. In many instances, indeed, they have led to such serious misunderstandings that they were only terminated by the duel.

From this statement I may remark here, though my observation may not be immediately to the point, that there is not, probably, that portion of entertainment, or that substantial pleasure, which people expected to find at these monthly meetings. The little jealousies arising about precedency, or about the admiration of one more than another; the falling in occasionally with disagreeable partners; the slights and omissions that are often thought to be purposely made; the head-aches, colds, sicknesses, and lassitude afterwards, must all of them operate as so many drawbacks from this pleasure: and it is not unusual to hear persons, fond of such amusements, complaining afterwards that they had not answered. There is therefore, probably, more pleasure in the preparations for such amusements, and in the previous talk about them, than in the amusements themselves.

It is also probable that the greatest pleasure felt in a ball-room is felt by those who go into it as spectators only. These perceive pleasure from the music, from the beat of the steps in unison with it, but particularly from the idea that all who join in the dance are happy. These considerations produce in the spectator cheerfulness and mirth; and these are continued to him more pure and unalloyed than in the former case, because he can have no drawbacks from the admission into his own breast of any of those uneasy and immoral passions above described.

But to return to the point in question:—The reader has now had the different cases laid before him, as determined by the moral philosopher. He has been conducted also through the interior of the ball-room. He will have perceived, therefore, that the arguments of the Quakers have gradually unfolded themselves, and that they are more or less conspicuous, or more or less true, as dancing is viewed abstractedly, or in connexion with these preparations and accompa-

niments that may be interwoven with it. If it be viewed in connexion with these preparations and accompaniments, and if these should be found to be so inseparably connected with it that they must invariably go together, (which is supposed to be the case where it is introduced into the ball-room,) he will have no difficulty in pronouncing that in this case it is objectionable as a Christian recreation. For it cannot be doubted that it has an immediate tendency in this case to produce a frivolous levity, to generate vanity and pride, and to call up passions of the malevolent kind. Now in this point of view it is that the Quakers generally consider dancing. They never view it, as I observed before, abstractedly, or solely by itself. They have therefore forbidden it to their Society, believing it to be the duty of a Christian to be serious in his conversation and deportment, to afford an example of humility, and to be watchful and diligent in the subjugation of his evil passions.

CHAPTER VI.

Novels—Novels forbidden—their fictitious nature no argument against them—arguments of the Quakers are, that they produce an affectation of knowledge, a romantic spirit, and a perverted morality; and that by creating an indisposition towards other kinds of reading, they prevent moral improvement and real delight of mind—Hence novel-reading more pernicious than many other amusements.

Among the prohibitions which the Quakers have adopted in their moral education, as barriers against vice, or as preservatives of virtue, I shall consider that next, which relates to the perusal of improper books. George Fox seems to have forgotten nothing that was connected with the morals of the Society. He was anxious for the purity of its character. He seemed afraid of every wind that blew, lest it should bring some noxious vapor to defile it. And as those things which were spoken or represented might corrupt the mind, so those which were written and printed might corrupt it also. He recommended, therefore, that the youth of his newly-formed society should abstain from the reading of romances. William Penn, and others, expressed the same sentiments on this subject. And the same opinion has been held by the Quakers, as a body of Christians, down to the present day. Hence novels, as a particular species of romance, and as that which is considered as of the worst tendency, have been particularly marked for prohibition.

Some Quakers have been inclined to think that novels ought to be rejected on account of the fictitious nature of their contents. But this consideration is by no means generally adopted by the Society as an argument against them. Nor would it be a sound argument, if it were. If novels contain no evil within themselves, or have no evil tendency, the mere circumstance of the subject, names, or characters, being feigned will not stamp them as censurable. Such fiction will not be like the fiction of the drama, where men act and personate characters that are not their own. Different men, in different ages of the world, have had recourse to different modes of writing for the promotion of virtue. Some have had recourse to allegories, others to fables. The fables of Æsop, though a fiction from the beginning to the end, have been useful to many. But we have a peculiar instance of the use and innocence of fictitious descriptions in the sacred writings. For the Author of the Christian religion made use of parables on many and weighty occasions. We cannot, therefore, condemn fictitious biography, unless it condemn itself by becoming a destroyer of the morals.

The arguments against novels, in which the Quakers agree as a body, are taken from the pernicious influence they have upon the minds of those who read them.

The Quakers do not say that all novels have this influence, but that they have it generally. The great demand for novels, in consequence of the taste which the world has shown for this species of writing, has induced persons of all descriptions, and of course many who have been ill qualified, to write them. Hence, though some novels have appeared of considerable merit, the worthless have been greatly preponderant. The demand also has occasioned foreign novels, of a complexion by no means suited to the good sense and character of our country, to be translated into our language. Hence a fresh weight has been thrown into the preponderating scale. From these two causes it has happened that the contents of a great majority of our novels have been unfavorable to the improvement of the moral character. Now, when we consider this circumstance, and when we consider likewise that professed novel-readers generally read all the compositions of this sort that come into their way; that they wait for no selection, but that they devour the good, bad and indifferent, alike; we shall see the reasons, which have induced the Quakers to believe that the effect of this species of writing upon the mind has been generally pernicious.

One of the effects which the members of this Society consider to be produced by novels upon those who read them, is an affectation of knowledge which leads them to become forward and presumptuous.

This effect is highly injurious; for while it raises them unduly in their own estimation, it lowers them in that of the world. Nothing can be more disgusting, in the opinion of the Quakers, than to see persons assuming the authoritative appearance of men and women, before their age or their talents can have given them any pretensions to do it.

Another effect is the following :—They conceive that there is among professed novel-readers a peculiar cast of mind. They observe in them a romantic spirit, a sort of wonder-loving imagination, and a disposition towards enthusiastic flights of the fancy, which to sober persons have the appearance of a temporary derangement. As the former effect must become injurious by producing forwardness, so this must become so by producing unsteadiness of character.

A third effect, which they find to be produced among this description of readers, is conspicuous in a perverted morality. Readers of this cast place almost every virtue in feeling, and in the affectation of benevolence. They consider these as the true and only sources of good. They make these equivalent to moral principle. And actions flowing from feeling, though feeling itself is not always well founded, and sometimes runs into compassion even against justice, they class as moral duties arising from moral principle. They consider also too frequently the laws of religion as barbarous restraints, and which their new notions of civilized refinement may relax at will; and they do not hesitate, in consequence, to give a colour to some fashionable vices, which no Christian painter would admit into any composition which was his own.

To this it may be added, that, believing their own knowledge to be supreme, and their own system of morality to be the only enlightened one, they fall often into skepticism, and pass easily from thence to infidelity. Foreign novels, however, more than our own, have probably contributed to the production of this latter effect.

These, then, are frequently the evils, and those which the Society insist upon, where persons devote their spare time to the reading of novels, but more particularly among females, who, on account of the greater delicacy of their constitution, are the more susceptible of such impressions. These effects the Quakers consider as highly injurious when they fall upon this sex. For an affectation of knowledge, or a forwardness of character, seems to be much more disgusting among women than among men. It may be observed also, that an unsteady or romantic spirit, or a wonder-loving or flighty imagination, can never qualify a woman for domestic duties, or make her a sedate and prudent wife. Nor can a relaxed morality qualify her for the discharge of her duty as parent in the religious education of her children.

But, independently of these, there is another evil, which the Society attach to novel-reading, of a nature too serious to be omitted in this account. It is, that those who are attached to this species of reading become indisposed towards any other.

This indisposition arises from the peculiar construction of novels. Their structure is similar to that of dramatic compositions. They exhibit characters to view. They have their heroes and heroines in the same manner. They lay open the checkered incidents in the lives of these. They interweave into their histories the powerful passion of love. By animated language, and descriptions which glow with sympathy, they rouse the sensibility of the reader, and fill his soul with interest in the tale. They fascinate, therefore, in the same manner as plays. They produce also the same kind of mutual stimulus*, or the same powerful excitement of the mind. Hence it is that this indisposition is generated. For, if other books contain neither characters nor incidents, nor any of the high seasoning or gross stimulants which belong to novels, they become insipid.

It is difficult to estimate the injury, which is done to persons by this last-mentioned effect of novel reading upon the mind. For the contents of our best books consist usually of plain and sober narrative. Works of this description give no extravagant representation of things, because their object is truth. They are found frequently without characters or catastrophes, because these would be often unsuitable to the nature of the subject of which they treat. They contain repellants rather than stimulants, because their design is the promotion of virtue. The novel-reader, therefore, by becoming indisposed towards these, excludes himself from moral improvement, and deprives himself of the most substantial pleasure which reading can produce. In vain do books on the study of nature unfold to him the treasures of the mineral or the vegetable world. He foregoes this addition to his knowledge, and this innocent food for his mind. In vain do books on science lay open to him the constitution and the laws of motion of bodies. This constitution and hesel a ws are still mysteries to him. In vain do books on religion discover to him the true path of happiness. He has still this path

* I have been told by a physician of the first eminence, that music and novels have done more to produce the sickly countenances and nervous habits of our highly-educated females, than any other causes that can be assigned. The excess of stimulus on the mind, from the interesting and melting tales that are peculiar to novels, affects the organs of the body, and relaxes the tone of the nerves, in the same manner as the melting tones of music have been described to act upon the constitution, after sedentary employment necessary for skill in that science, has injured it.

to seek. Neither, if he were to dip into works like these, but particularly into those of the latter description, could he enjoy them. This latter consideration makes the reading of novels a more pernicious employment than any others. For though there may be amusements, which may sometimes produce injurious effects to those who partake them, yet these may be counteracted by the perusal of works of a moral tendency. The effects, on the other hand, which are produced by the reading of novels, seem to admit of no corrective or cure. For how, for instance, shall a perverted morality, which is considered to be one of them, be rectified, if the book, which is to contain the advice for this purpose, be so uninteresting or insipid, that the persons in question have no disposition to peruse it?

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION I.

Diversions of the field—Diversions of the field forbidden—General thoughtlessness on this subject—Sentiments of Thomson—Sentiments of George Fox—of Edward Burroughs—Similar sentiments of Cowper—Law of the Society on the subject.

The diversions of the field are usually followed by people, without any consideration whether they are justifiable either in the eye of morality or of reason. Men receive them as the customs of their ancestors, and they are therefore not likely to entertain doubts concerning their propriety. The laws of the country also sanction them; for we find regulations and qualifications on the subject. Those, also, who attend these diversions, are so numerous, and their rank and station and character are often such, that they sanction them again by their example; so that few people think of making any inquiry, how far they are allowable as pursuits.

But though this general thoughtlessness prevails upon the subject, and though many have fallen into these diversions, as into the common customs of the world, yet benevolent and religious individuals have not allowed them to pass unnoticed, nor been backward in their censures and reproofs.

It has been matter of astonishment to some, how men, who have the powers of reason, can waste their time in galloping after dogs, in a wild and tumultuous manner, to the detriment often of their neighbors, and to the hazard of their own lives; or how men, who

are capable of high intellectual enjoyments, can derive pleasure, so as to join in shouts of triumph on account of the death of a harmless animal; or how men, who have organic feelings, and who know that other living creatures have the same, can make an amusement of that which puts brute-animals to pain.

Good poets have spoken the language of enlightened nature upon this subject. Thomson, in his Seasons, introduces the diversions of the field in the following manner:

> "Here the rude clamor of the sportsman's joy,
> The gun fast-thund'ring, and the winded horn,
> Would tempt the Muse to sing the rural game."

But further on he observes:

> "These are not subjects for the peaceful Muse,
> Nor will she stain with such her spotless song;
> Then most delighted, when she social sees
> The whole mix'd animal-creation round
> Alive and happy. 'Tis not joy to her
> This falsely cheerful barbarous game of death."

Cowper, in his Task, in speaking in praise of the country, takes occasion to express his disapprobation of one of the diversions in question:

> "They love the country, and none else, who seek
> For their own sake its silence and its shade,
> Delights, which who would leave that has a heart
> Susceptible of pity, or a mind
> Cultur'd, and capable of sober thought,
> For all the savage din of the swift pack
> And clamors of the field? Detested sport!
> That owes its pleasure to another's pain,
> That feeds upon the sobs and dying shrieks
> Of harmless Nature, dumb, but yet endued
> With eloquence, that agonies inspire,
> Of silent tears, and heart-distending sighs!
> Vain tears, alas! and sighs that never find
> A corresponding tone in jovial souls!"

In these sentiments of the poets, the Quakers, as a religious body, have long joined. George Fox specifically reprobated hunting and hawking, which were the field-diversions of his own time. He had always shown, as I stated in the Introduction, a tender disposition to brute-animals, by reproving those who had treated them improperly in his presence, He considered these diversions as unworthy of the time and attention of men, who ought to have much higher

objects of pursuit. He believed, also, that real Christians could never follow them; for a Christian was a renovated man, and a renovated man could not but know the works of creation better than to subject them to his abuse.

Edward Burroughs, who lived at the same time, and was an able minister of the Society, joined George Fox in his sentiments with respect to the treatment of animals. He considered that man in the fall, or the apostate man, had a vision so indistinct and vitiated, that he could not see the animals of the creation as he ought; but that the man who was restored, or the spiritual Christian, had a new and clear discernment concerning them, which would oblige him to consider and treat them in a proper manner.

The idea of George Fox, and of Edward Burroughs, seems to have been adopted or patronised by the poet Cowper:

> "Thus harmony and family accord
> Were driv'n from Paradise; and in that hour
> The seeds of cruelty, that since have swell'd
> To such gigantic and enormous growth,
> Were sown in human-nature's fruitful soil.
> Hence date the persecution and the pain
> That man inflicts on all inferior kinds,
> Regardless of their plaints. To make him sport,
> To gratify the phrensy of his wrath,
> Or his base gluttony, are causes good
> And just, in his account, why bird and beast
> Should suffer torture"——

Thus the Quakers censured these diversions from the first formation of their Society, and laid down such moral principles, with respect to the treatment of animals, as were subversive of their continuance. These principles continued to actuate all true members who were their successors; and they gave proof by their own conduct that they were influenced by them, not only in treating the different animals under their care with tenderness, but in abstaining from all diversions in which their feelings could be hurt. The diversions, however, of the field, notwithstanding that this principle of the treatment of the brute-creation had been long recognised, and that no person of approved character in the Society followed them, began in time to be resorted to occasionally by the young and thoughtless members, either out of curiosity, or with a view of trying them as a means of producing pleasure. These deviations, however, from the true spirit of Quakerism, became at length known; and the Society, that no excuse might be left to any for engaging in such pursuits again, came to a resolution in one of their

yearly meetings, giving advice upon the subject in the following words:

"We clearly rank the practice of hunting and shooting for diversion with vain sports; and we believe the awakened mind may see, that even the leisure of those whom Providence hath permitted to have a competence of worldly goods is but ill filled up with these amusements. Therefore, being not only accountable for our substance, but also for our time, let our leisure be employed in serving our neighbor, and not in distressing the creatures of God for our amusement*."

I shall not take upon me to examine the different reasons, upon which we find the foundation of this law. I shall not inquire how far a man's substance, or rather his talent, is wasted or misapplied, in feeding a number of dogs in a costly manner, while the poor of the neighborhood may be starving, or how far the galloping after these is, in the eye of Christianity, a misapplication of a person's time. I shall adhere only to that part of the argument, how far a person has a right to make a† pleasure of that which occasions pain and death to the animal-creation: and I shall show in what manner the Quakers argue upon this subject, and how they persuade themselves that they have no right to pursue such diversions, but particularly when they consider themselves as a body of professing Christians.

SECTION II.

Diversions of the field judged, first, by the morality of the Old Testament—Original charter to kill animals—Condition annexed to it—Sentiments of Cowper—Rights and duties springing from this charter—Violation of it the violation of a moral law—Diversions in question not allowable by this standard.

The Quakers usually try the lawfulness of field diversions, which include hunting and shooting, by two standards; and, first, by the morality of the Old Testament.

They believe, in common with other Christians, that men have a right to take away the lives of animals for their food. The great

---

* Book of Extracts.

† The Quakers, and the poet Cowper likewise, in their laudable zeal for the happiness of the brute-creation, have given an improper description of the nature of the crime of these diversions. They have made it to consist in a man's deriving pleasure from the sufferings of the animals in question; whereas it should have been made to consist in his making a pleasure of a pursuit which puts them to pain. The most abandoned sportsman, it is to be presumed, never hunts them because he enjoys their sufferings. His pleasure arises from considerations of another nature.

Creator of the universe, to whom every thing that is in it belongs, gave to Noah and his descendants a grant or charter for this purpose. In this charter no exception is made. Hence, wild animals are included in it equally with the tame. And hence, a hare may as well be killed, if people have occasion for food, as a chicken or a lamb.

They believe, also, that when the Creator of the universe gave men dominion over the whole brute-creation, or delivered this creation into their hands, he intended them the right of destroying such animals as circumstances warranted them in supposing would become injurious to themselves. The preservation of themselves, which is the first law of nature, and the preservation of other animals under their care, created this new privilege.

But though men have the power given them over the lives of animals, there is a condition in the same charter, that they shall take them with as little pain as possible to the creatures. If the death of animals is to be made serviceable to men, the least they can do in return is to mitigate their sufferings while they expire. This obligation the Supreme Being imposed upon those, to whom he originally gave the charter, by the command of not eating their flesh while the life's-blood was in it. The Jews obliged all their converts to religion, even the Proselytes of the gate, who were not considered to be so religious as the Proselytes of the Covenant, to observe what they called the seventh commandment of Noah or that "they should not eat the member of any beast that was taken from it while it was alive*." This law, therefore, of blood, whatever other objects it might have in view, enjoined that, while men were engaged in the distressing task of taking away the life of an animal, they should respect its feelings, by abstaining from torture or all unnecessary pain.

"On Noah, and in him on all mankind,
The charter was conferr'd, by which we hold
The flesh of animals in fee, and claim
O'er all we feed on pow'r of life and death.
But read the instrument and mark it well.
Th' oppression of a tyrannous control
Can find no warrant there. Feed, then, and yield
Thanks for thy food. Carnivorous, through sin,
Feed on the slain, but spare the living brute!"

COWPER.

* It seems almost impossible that men could be so depraved as to take flesh to eat from a poor animal while alive; and yet, from the law enjoined to Proselytes of the Gate, it is probable that it was the case. Bruce, whose Travels into Abyssinia are gaining ground in credit, asserts that such customs obtained there. And the Harleian Miscellany, vol. vi. p. 126, in which is a modern account of Scotland, written in 1670, states the same practice as having existed in our own island.

From this charter, and from the great condition annexed to it, the Quakers are of opinion that rights and duties have sprung up,—rights in behalf of animals, and duties on the part of men,—and that a breach of these duties, however often or however thoughtlessly it may take place, is a breach of a moral law. For this charter did not relate to those animals only which live in the particular country of the Jews, but those in all countries wherever Jews might dwell. Nor was the observance of it confined to the Jews only, but it was to extend to the Proselytes of the Covenant and of the Gate. Nor was the observance of it confined to these proselytes; but it was to extend to all nations, because all animals of the same species are, in all countries, organized alike, and have all similar feelings; and because all animals of every kind are susceptible of pain.

In trying the lawfulness of the diversions of the field, as the Quakers do, by this charter, and by the great condition that is annexed to it, I purpose, in order to save time, to confine myself to hunting; for this will appear to be the most objectionable if examined in this manner.

It must be obvious, then, that hunting, even in the case of hares, is seldom followed for the purpose of food. It is very uncertain, in the first place, whether, in the course of the chase, they can be preserved whole, when they are taken, so as to be fit to be eaten. And, in the second, it may be observed that we may see fifty horsemen after a pack of hounds, no one of whom has any property in the pack, nor of course any right to the prey. These cannot even pretend that their object is food either for themselves or others.

Neither is hunting, where foxes are the object in view, pursued upon the principle of the destruction of noxious animals. For it may be observed that rewards are frequently offered to those who will procure them for the chase; that large woods or covers are frequently allotted them, that they may breed, and perpetuate their species for the same purpose; and that a poor man in the neighborhood of a fox-hunter would be sure to experience his displeasure, if it were known that he had destroyed any of these animals.

With respect to the mode of destroying them in either of these cases, (which is the next consideration), it is not as expeditious as it might be made by other means. It is, on the other hand, peculiarly cruel. A poor animal is followed, not for minutes, but frequently for an hour, and sometimes for hours, in pain and agony. Its sufferings begin with its first fear. Under this fear, perpetually accompanying it, it flies from the noise of horses and horsemen, and the cries of dogs; it pants for breath till the panting becomes difficult and painful; it becomes wearied even to misery, yet dares not

rest; and, under a complication of these sufferings, it is at length overtaken, and often literally torn to pieces by it pursuers.

Hunting, therefore, does not appear, in the opinion of the Quakers, to be followed for any of those purposes which alone, according to the original charter, give mankind a right over the lives of brutes. It is neither followed for food, nor for prevention of injury to man, or to the creatures belonging to him. Neither is life taken away by means of it as mercifully as it ought to be, according to the meaning of the great condition.* But if hunting be not justifiable, when examined upon these three principles, it can never be justifiable, in the opinion of this Society, when it is followed on the principle of pleasure. All destruction of animal life upon this last principle must come within the charge of wanton cruelty, and be considered as a violation of a moral law.

SECTION III.

Diversions of the field judged, secondly, by the morality of the New Testament—The renovated man, or Christian, has a clearer knowledge of creation and of its uses—he views animals as the creatures of God—hence he finds animals to have rights, independently of any written law—he collects, again, new rights from the benevolence of his new feelings—and new rights, again, from the written word of Revelation.

The Quakers try the lawfulness of these diversions, again, by the morality of the New Testament. They adopt, in the first place, upon this occasion, the idea of George Fox and of Edward Burroughs, which has been already stated; and they follow it up in the manner which I shall now explain.

They believe that a man under the new Covenant, or one who is really a Christian, is a renovated man. As long as Adam preserved his primæval innocence, or continued in the image of his Maker, his spiritual vision was clear. When he lost this image, it became dim, short, and confused. This is the case, the Society believe, with every apostate or wicked man. He sees through a vitiated medium. He sees, of course, nothing of the harmony of the creation. He has but a confused knowledge of the natures and ends of things. These natures and these ends he never examines as he ought, but, in the confusion of his moral vision, he abuses and perverts them. Hence it generally happens that an apostate man is cruel to his brute. But in proportion as he is restored to the divine image, or becomes as Adam was before he fell, or in proportion as he exchanges earthly

* The netting of animals for food is perfectly unobjectionable upon these principles.

for spiritual views, he sees all things through a clearer medium. It is then, the Quakers believe, that the creation is opened to him, and that he finds the Creator has made nothing in vain. It is then that he knows the natures of things, that he estimates their uses and their ends, and that he will never stretch these beyond their proper bounds. Beholding animals in this sublime light, he will appreciate their strength, their capacities, and their feelings; and he will never use them but for the purposes intended by Providence. It is then that the creation will delight him. It is then that he will find a growing love to the animated objects of it. And this knowledge of their natures, and this love of them, will oblige him to treat them with due tenderness and respect. Hence, all animals will have a security in the breast of every Christian, or renovated man, against oppression or abuse. He will never destroy them wantonly, nor put them to unnecessary pain. Now the Quakers are of opinion that every person, who professes Christianity, ought to view things as the man who is renovated would view them, and that it therefore becomes them in particular, as a body of highly professing Christians, to view them in the same manner. Hence, they uniformly look upon animals not as brute machines, to be used at discretion, but as the creatures of God, of whose existence the use and intention ought always to be considered, and to whom duties arise out of this spiritual feeling, independently of any written law in the Old Testament, or any grant or charter, by which their happiness might be secured.

The members therefore of this Society, viewing animals in this light, believe that they are bound to treat them accordingly. Hence, the instigation of two horses by whips and spurs, for a trial of speed, in consequence of a moneyed stake, is considered by them to be criminal. The horse was made for the use of man, to carry his body and transport his burthens; but he was never made to engage in painful conflicts with other horses, on account of the avarice of his owner. Hence, the pitting together of two cocks for a trial of victory is considered as equally criminal. For the cock, whatever may be his destined object among the winged creation, has been long useful to man in awakening him from unseasonable slumber, and in sounding to him the approach of day. But it was never intended that he should be employed to the injury and destruction of himself, or to the injury and destruction of his own species. In the same manner the Quakers condemn the hunting of animals, except on the plea of necessity, or that they cannot be destroyed, if their death be required, in any other way. For, whatever may be their several uses, or the several ends of their existence in creation, they were never created to be so used by man, that they should suffer, and this entirely for his sport.

Whoever puts animals to cruel and unnatural uses, disturbs, in the opinion of the Quakers, the harmony of creation, and offends God.

They are of opinion, in the second place, that the renovated man must have, in his own benevolent spirit, such an exalted sense of the benevolent spirit of the Creater, as to believe that he never constituted any part of animated nature, without assigning it its proper share of happiness during the natural time of its existence; or, that it was to have its moment, its hour, its day, or its year of pleasure. And if this be the case, he must believe also, that any interruption of its tranquility, without the plea of necessity, must be an innovation of its rights as a living being.

They believe, also, that the renovated man, who loves all the works of the Creator, will carry every divine law, which has been revealed to him, as far as it is possible to be carried on account of a similarity of natures, through all animated creation, and particularly that law, which forbids him to do to another what he would dislike to be done unto himself. Now this law is founded on the sense of bodily, and on the sense of mental feeling. The mental feelings of men and brutes, or the reason of man and the instinct of animals, are different. But their bodily feelings are alike, and they are in due proportions susceptible of pain. The nature, therefore, of man and of animals is alike in this particular. He can anticipate and know their feelings by his own. He cannot, therefore, subject them to any action unnecessarily, if on account of a similar construction of his own organs such an action would produce pain to himself. His own power of feeling strongly commands sympathy with all that can feel. And that general sympathy, which arises to a man when he sees pain inflicted on the person of any individual of his own species, will arise, in the opinion of the Quakers, to the renovated man, when he sees it inflicted on the body of any brute.

CHAPTER VIII.

Objections started by philosophical moralists to the preceding system of education—"This system a prohibitory one—Prohibitions sometimes the cause of greater evils than they prevent—they may confuse morality and break the spirit—they render the vicious more vicious—and are not to be relied upon as effectual, because built on a false foundation—Ignorance is no guardian of virtue—Causes, not sub-causes, are to be contended against—No certain security but in knowledge and a love of virtue—Prohibitions, where effectual, produce a sluggish virtue."

I HAVE now mentioned the principal prohibitions that are to be found in the moral education of the Quakers; and I have annexed to

these the various reasons which they themselves give why they were introduced into their Society. I have therefore finished this part of my task, and the reader will expect me to proceed to the next subject. But as I am certain that many objections will be started here, I shall stop for a few minutes to state and consider them.

The Quakers differ on the subject of moral education very materially from the world, and indeed from those of the world, who, having had a more than ordinary liberal education, may be supposed to have, in most cases, a more than ordinary correct judgment. The Quaker system, as we have seen, consists principally of specific prohibitions. These prohibitions, again, are extended occasionally to things which are not in themselves vicious. They are extended, again, to these, because it is possible that they may be made productive of evil. And they are founded apparently on the principle, that ignorance of such things secures innocence; or that ignorance, in such cases, has the operation of a preventive of vice, or a preservative of virtue.

Philosophical moralists, on the other hand, are friends to occasional indulgencies. They see nothing inherently or necessarily mischievous, either in the theatre, or in the concert-room, or in the ball-room, or in the circulating library, or in many other places of resort. If a young female, say they, situated in a provincial town, were to see a play annually, would it not give her animation, and afford a spring to her heart? Or if a youth were to see a play two or three times in the year, might not his parents, if they were to accompany him, make it each time, by their judicious and moral remarks, subservient to the improvement of his morals? Neither do these moralists anticipate any danger by looking to distant prospects, where the things are innocent in themselves. And they are of opinion that all dangers may be counteracted effectually, not by prohibitory checks and guards, but by storing the mind with knowledge, and filling it with love of virtue. The arguments, therefore, which these will advance against the system of the moral education of the Quakers, may be seen in the following words:

"All prohibitions, they contend, should be avoided, as much as possible, in moral education; for prohibitions may often become the cause of greater immorality than they were intended to prevent. The fable of the hen, whose very prohibitions led her chickens to the fatal well, has often been realized in life. There is a certain curiosity in human nature to look into things forbidden. If Quaker-youth should have the same desires in this respect as others, they cannot gratify them but at the expense of their virtue. If they wish for novels, for example, they must get them clandestinely. If to go to

the theatre, they must go in secret. But they must do more than this in the latter case; for, as they would be known by their dress, they must change it for that of another person. Hence, they may be made capable of intrigue, hyprocrisy, and deceit.

"Prohibitions, again, they believe, except they be well founded, may confound the notions of children on the subject of morality; for, if they are forbidden to what they see so many worthy and enlightened persons do, they may never know where to fix the boundaries between vice and virtue.

"Prohibitions, again, they consider, if made without an allowance of exceptions, as having a tendency to break the spirit of youth. Break a horse in the usual way, and teach him to stop with the check of the reins, and you break him and preserve his courage. But put him in a mill to break him, and you break his life and animation. Prohibitions, therefore, may hinder elevated feelings, and may lead to poverty and sordidness of spirit.

"Prohibitions, again, they believe, if youth once depart from the right way, render them more vicious characters than common. This arises from the abruptness or suddenness of transition. For, having been shut up within narrow boundaries for a part of their lives, they go greater lengths, when once let loose, than others who have not been equally curbed and confined.

"But while they are of opinion that prohibitions are likely to be thus injurious to Quaker-youth, they are of opinion that they are never to be relied upon as effectual guardians of morality, because they consider them as built upon false principles.

"They are founded, they conceive, on the principal, that ignorance is a security for innocence; or that vice is so attractive, that we cannot resist it, but by being kept out of its way. In the first case, they contend that the position is false; for ignorant persons are of all others the most likely, when they fall into temptation, to be seduced. And, in the second, they contend that there is a distrust of Divine Providence in his moral government of the world.

"They are founded, again, they conceive, on false principles, inasmuch as the Quakers confound causes with sub-causes, or causes with occasions. If a person, for example, were to get over a hedge, and receive a thorn in his hand, and die of the wound, this thorn would be only the occasion, and not the cause, of his death. The bad state, in which his body must have been, to have made this wound fatal, would have been the original cause. In like manner, neither the theatre nor the ball-room are the causes of the bad passions that are to be found there. All these passions must have existed in persons previously to their entrance into these places. Plays, therefore, or

novels, or public dances, are only the sub-causes, or the occasions, of calling forth the passions in question. The real cause is in the infected state of the mind, or in the want of knowledge, or in the want of a love of virtue.

"Prohibitions, therefore, though they may become partial checks to vice, can never, they believe, be relied upon as effectual guardians of virtue. Bars and bolts seldom prevent thieves from robbing a house. But if armed men should be in it, who would venture to enter in? In the same manner the mind of man should be armed or prepared. It should be so furnished, that men should be able to wander through a vicious world amidst all its foibles and its follies, and pass uncontaminated by them. It should have that tone given to it, which should hinder all circumstances from becoming occasions. But this can never be done by locking up the heart to keep vice out of it, but by filling it with knowledge and with a love of virtue.

"That this is the only method to be relied upon in moral education, they conceive, may be shown by considering upon whom the pernicious effects of the theatre, or of the ball room, or of the circulating library, principally fall. Do they not fall principally upon those who have never had a dignified education? 'Empty noddles,' it is said, 'are fond of playhouses;' and the converse is true, that persons, whose understandings have been enriched, and whose tastes have been corrected, find all such recreations tiresome; at least they find so much to disgust them, that what they approve does not make them adequate amends. This is the case, also, with respect to novels. These do harm principally to barren minds. They do harm to those who have no proper employment for their time, or to those who, in the manners, conversation, and conduct of their parents, or of others with whom they associate, have no examples of pure thinking, or of pure living, or of a pure taste. They, on the other hand, who have been taught to love good books, will never run after or be affected by bad ones. And the same mode of reasoning, they conceive, is applicable to other cases. For, if people are taught to love virtue for virtue's sake, and, in like manner, to hate what is unworthy because they have a genuine and living knowledge of its unworthiness, neither the ball nor concert room, nor the theatre, nor the circulating library, nor the diversions of the field, will have charms enough to seduce them, or to injure the morality of their minds.

"To sum up the whole: The prohibitions of the Quakers, in the first place, may become injurious, in the opinion of these philosophical moralists, by occasioning greater evils than they were intended to prevent. They can never, in the second place, be relied upon as effectual guardians of virtue, because they consider them to be

founded on false principles. And if at any time they can believe them to be effectual in the office assigned them, they believe them to be productive only of a cold or a sluggish virtue."

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION I.

Reply of the Quakers to these objections—They say, first, that they are to be guided by revelation in the education of their children—and that the education which they adopt is sanctioned by revelation, and by the practice of the early Christians—They maintain, again, that the objections are not applicable to them; for these presuppose circumstances concerning them which are not true—They allow the system of filling the mind with virtue to be the most desirable—but they maintain that it cannot be acted upon abstractedly—and that, if it could, it would be as dangerous as philosophical moralists make the system of the prohibitions.

To these objections the Quakers make the following reply:

They do not look up either to their own imaginations, or to the imaginations of others for any rule in the education of their children. As a Christian Society they conceive themselves bound to be guided by revelation, and by revelation only, while it has any injunctions to offer which relate to this subject.

In adverting to the Old Testament, they find that no less than nine, out of the ten commandments of Moses, are of a prohibitory nature; and in adverting to the New, that many of the doctrines of Jesus Christ, and the Apostles, are delivered in the form of prohibitions.

They believe that revealed religion prohibits them from following all those pursuits which the objections notice; for though there is no specific prohibition of each, yet there is an implied one in the spirit of Christianity. Thus, for example, violent excitements of the passions on sensual subjects must be unfavorable to religious advancement. Worldly pleasures must hinder those which are spiritual. Impure words, and spectacles, must affect morals. Not only evil is to be avoided, but even the appearance of evil. Whilst, therefore, these sentiments are acknowledged by Christianity, it is to be presumed that the customs, which the objections notice, are to be avoided in Christian education; and as the Quakers consider these to be forbidden to themselves, they feel themselves obliged to forbid them to others. And in these particular prohibitions they consider them-

selves as sanctioned both by the writings and the practices of the early Christians.

In looking at the objections, which have been made, with a view of replying to them, they would observe, first, that these objections do not seem to apply to them, as a Society, because they presuppose circumstances concerning them which are not true. They presuppose, first, that their moral education is founded on prohibitions solely; whereas they endeavor, both by the communication of positive precepts and by their example, to fill the minds of their children with a love of virtue. They presuppose, again, that they are to mix with the world, and to follow the fashions of the world; in which case a moderate knowledge of the latter, with suitable advice when they are followed, is considered as enabling them to pass through life with less danger than the prohibition of the same; whereas they mix but little with persons of other denominations. They abjure the world, that they may not imbibe its spirit. And here they would observe, that the knowledge which is recommended to be obtained, by going through perilous customs, is not necessary for them as a Society. For living much at home, and mixing almost solely with one another, they consider their education as sufficient for their wants.

If the Quakers could view the two different systems abstractedly, that of filling the heart with virtue, and that of shutting it out from a knowledge of vice, so that these could be acted upon separately, and so that the first of the two were practicable, and practicable without having to go through scenes that were dangerous to virtue, they would have no hesitation in giving the preference to the former; because, if men could be taught to love virtue for virtue's sake, all the trouble of prohibitions would be unnecessary.

But the Quakers would conceive that the system of filling the mind with virtue, if acted upon abstractedly or by itself, would be impracticable with respect to youth. To make it practicable, children must be born with the full-grown intellect and experience of men. They must have an innate knowledge of all the tendencies, the bearings, the relations, and the effects of virtue and vice. They must be also strong enough to look temptation in the face; whereas youth have no such knowledge or experience, or strength or power.

They would consider, also, the system of filling the mind with virtue as impossible, if attempted abstractedly or alone, because it is not in human wisdom to devise a method of inspiring it with this essence, without first teaching it to abstain from vice. It is impossible, they would say, for a man to be virtuous, or to be in love with virtue, except he were to lay aside his vicious practices. The first step to virtue, according both to the Heathen and the Christian

philosophy, is to abstain from vice. We are to cease to do evil, and to learn to do well. This is the process recommended. Hence, prohibitions are necessary. Hence, sub-causes as well as causes are to be attacked. Hence, abstinence from vice is a Christian, though it may be a sluggish, virtue. Hence, innocence is to be aimed at by an ignorance of vice. And hence, we must prohibit all evil, if we wish for the assistance of the moral Governor of the world.

But if the system of filling the heart with virtue were even practicable of itself, that is, without the aid of prohibitions, yet, if it be to be followed by allowing young persons to pass through the various amusements of the world which the Society prohibit, and by giving them moral advice at the same time, they would be of opinion that more danger would accrue to their morality, than any which the prohibitions could produce. The prohibitions, as far as they have a tendency to curb the spirit, would not be injurious in the opinion of the Quakers, because it is their plan in education to produce humble, passive, and obedient subjects, and because spirit, or high-mindedness, or high feeling, is no trait in the Christian character. As far as the curiosity, which is natural to man, would instigate him to look into things forbidden, which he could not always do, in the particular situation of the Quakers, without the admission of intrigue, or hypocrisy, or deceit, prohibitions would be to be considered as evils, though they would always be necessary evils. But the Quakers would apprehend that the same number of youth would not be lost by passing through the ordeal of prohibitory education, as through the ordeal of the system, which attempts to fill the mind with virtue by inuring it to scenes, which may be dangerous to its morality. For if tastes are to be cultivated, and knowledge to be had, by adopting the amusements which they prohibit, many would be lost, though some might be advanced to virtue. For parents cannot always accompany their children to such places, nor, if they could, can they prevent these from fascinating. If these should fascinate, they will suggest repetitions. But frequent repetitions, where you accustom youth to see, to hear, and to think, what ought never to be seen, heard, or thought of, by Christians, cannot but have the effect of tingeing the character in time. This mode of education would be considered by the Quakers as answering to that of dear bought experience. A person may come to see the beauty of virtue, when his constitution has been shattered by vice. But many will perish in the midst of so hazardous a trial.*

---

* Though no attempt is to be made to obtain knowledge, according to the Christian system, through the medium of customs which may be of improper ten-

SECTION II.

Quakers contend, by way of further reply to the objections, that their system of education has been practically or experimentally beneficial—Two facts in behalf of this assertion—the first is, that young Quakers get earlier into the wisdom of life than many others—the second, that there are few disorderly persons in the Society—Error corrected, that the Quakers turn persons out of the Society as soon as they begin to be vicious, that it may be rescued from the disgrace of a bad character.

The answers, which have hitherto been given to the reader, may be considered as the statement of theory against theory. But the Quakers would say further upon this subject, that they have educated upon these principles for a hundred-and-fifty years, and that, where they have been attended to, their effects have been uniformly beneficial. They would be fearful, therefore, of departing from a path, which they conceive their own experience, and that of their ancestors, has shown them to be safe, and which, after all their enquiries, they believe to be that which is pointed out to them by the Christian religion. I shall not attempt to follow up this practical argument by any history of the lives of the members of this Society, but shall content myself with one or two simple facts, which appear to me to be materially to the point.

In the first place I may observe, that it is an old saying, that "it is difficult to put old heads on young shoulders." The Quakers, however, do this more effectually than any other people. It has often been observed that a Quaker-boy has an unnatural appearance. This idea has arisen from his dress and his sedateness, which, together, have produced an appearance of age above the youth in his countenance, or the stature of his person. This, however, is confessing, in some degree, in the case before us, that the discretion of age has appeared upon youthful shoulders. It is certainly an undeniable fact, that the youth of this Society, generally speaking, get earlier into a knowledge of just sentiments, or into a knowledge of human nature, or into a knowledge of the true wisdom of life, than those of the world at large. I have often been surprised to hear young Quakers talk of the folly and vanity of pursuits, in which persons older than themselves were then embarking for the purposes of pleasure, and which the same persons have afterwards found to have been the pursuits only of uneasiness and pain.

Let us stop for a while, just to look at the situation of some of

---

dency, yet it does not follow that knowledge, properly obtained, is not a powerful guardian of virtue. This important subject may probably be resumed in a future volume.

those young persons, who, in consequence of a different education, are introduced to the pleasures of the world, as to those which are to constitute their happiness. We see them running eagerly first after this object, then after that. One man says to himself, "this will constitute my pleasure." He follows it. He finds it vanity and vexation of spirit. He says, again, "I have found myself deceived. I now see my happiness in other pleasures, and not in those where I fancied it." He follows these. He becomes sickened. He finds the result different from his expectations. He pursues pleasure, but pleasure is not gained.

> "They are lost
> In chase of fancied happiness, still woo'd
> And never won. Dream after dream ensues,
> And still they dream that they shall still succeed,
> And still are disappointed."
>
> COWPER.

Thus, after having wasted a considerable portion of his time, he is driven at last by positive experience into the truth of those maxims, which philosophy and religion have established, and in the pursuit of which alone he now sees that true happiness is to be found. Thus, in consequence of his education, he loses two-thirds of his time in tedious and unprofitable, if not in baneful, pursuits. The young Quaker, on the other hand, comes by means of his education to the same maxims of philosophy and religion, as the foundation of his happiness, at a very early period of life, and therefore saves the time, and preserves the constitution, which the other has been wasting for want of this early knowledge. I know of no fact more striking or more true in the Quaker-history than this; namely, that the youth who is educated as a Quaker, gets such a knowledge of human nature, and of the paths to wisdom and happiness, at an early age, that, though he is known by his countenance to be but a young mariner, he is enabled to conduct his bark through the dangerous rocks and shoals of life, with greater safety than many others, who have been longer on the ocean of this probationary world.

I may observe, again, as the second fact, that it is not unusual to hear persons say that you seldom see a disorderly member of this Society, or that a Quaker prostitute or a Quaker criminal is unknown. These declarations, frequently and openly made, show at least that there is an opinion among the world at large that the Quakers are a moral people.

The mention of this fact leads me to the notice and the correction of an error, which I have found to have been taken up by individuals.

It is said by these that the Society is very wary with respect to its disorderly members; for that when any of them behave ill they are expelled it, in order to rescue it from the disgrace of a bad character. Thus, if a woman, belonging to it, were discovered to be a prostitute, or a man, belonging to it, to be taken up for a criminal offence, no disgrace could attach to this, as it would to other communities; for if in the course of a week, after a discovery had been made of their several offences, any person were to state that two such persons had become infamous, it would be retorted upon him that they were not members of the Society.

It will be proper to observe upon the subject of this error, that, if the parties in question were not disowned previously to the discovery of such infamous conduct, the rules of the Society would not admit of expulsion in the hasty manner supposed. But it is more probable that these persons, long before such facts could be known, had been both admonished and disowned, than that the Quakers would have occasion to disown them after the discovery of such infamy. For there is great truth in the old maxim,—"Nemo repente fuit turpissimus," or "no man was ever all at once a rogue." So in the case of these persons, as of all others, they must have been vicious by degrees; they must have shown symptoms of some deviations from rectitude, before the measure of their iniquity could have been completed. But by the constitution of Quakerism, as will appear soon, no person of the Society can be found erring, even for the first time, without being liable to be privately admonished. These admonitions may be repeated for weeks, or for months, or even for years, before the subjects of them are pronounced so incorrigible as to be disowned. There is great reason therefore to presume, in the case before us, though the offenders in question would have undoubtedly been disowned by the Quakers, after they were known to be such, yet that they had been disowned long before their offences had been made public.

Upon the whole, it may be allowed that young Quakers arrive at the knowledge of just sentiments, or at the true wisdom of life, earlier than those who are inured to the fashions of the world: and it may be allowed, also, that the Quakers, as a body, are a moral people. Now, these effects will generally be considered as the result of education; and though the prohibitions of the Quakers may not be considered as the only instruments of producing these effects, yet they must be allowed to be component parts of the system, which produces them.

DISCIPLINE OF THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.

Discipline of two kinds—as it relates to the regulation of the internal affairs of the Society—or to the cognisance of immoral conduct—Difficulty of procuring obedience to moral precepts—this attempted to be obviated by George Fox—outlines of his system for this purpose—additions made to his system since his time—objections to the system considered—this system, or the discipline of the Quakers, as far as this branch of it is concerned, the great foundation-stone on which their moral education is supported.

The Discipline of the Quakers is divisible into two parts. The first may comprehend the Regulation of the Internal Affairs of the Society, such as the management of the poor belonging to it; the granting of certificates of removal to its members; the hearing of their appeals upon various occasions; the taking cognisance of their proposals of marriage, and the like. The second may comprehend the notice or observance of the moral conduct of individuals, with a view of preserving the rules, which the Quakers have thought it their duty to make, and the testimonies, which they have thought it their duty to bear, as a Christian people. It is to the latter part of the discipline that I shall principally confine myself in the ensuing part of my work.

Nothing is more true than that, when men err in their moral practice, it is not for want of good precepts, or of wholesome advice. There are few books from which we cannot collect some moral truths; and few men so blind as not to be able to point out to us the boundaries of moral good. The pages of revelation have been long unfolded to our view, and diffusively spread among us. We have had the advantage, too, of having their contents frequently and publicly repeated in our ears. And yet, knowing what is right, we do not pursue it. We go off, on the contrary, against our better knowledge, into the road to evil. Now it was the opinion of George Fox, that something might be done to counteract this infirmity of human nature, or to make a man keep up to the precepts which he believed to have been divinely inspired, or, in other words, that a system of discipline might be devised for regulating, exciting and preserving, the conduct of a Christian.

This system he at length completed, and, as he believed, with the divine aid, and introduced into the Society with the approbation of those, who belonged to it.

The great principle upon which he founded it was, that every Christian was bound to watch over another, for his good. This principle included two ideas. First, that vigilance over the moral conduct of individuals was a Christian duty. Secondly, that any interference with persons, who might err, was solely for their good. Their reformation was the only object in view. Hence religious advice was necessary. Hence, it was to be administered with tenderness and patience. Hence, nothing was to be left undone, while there was hope that anything could be done, for their spiritual welfare.

From this view of the subject, he enjoined it to all the members of his newly-formed Society to be watchful over the conduct of one another, and not to hesitate to step in for the recovery of those, whom they might discover to be overtaken with a fault.

He enjoined it to them, again, that they should follow the order recommended by Jesus Christ upon such occasions: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that, in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it into the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen-man or publican*."

For the carrying of this system into execution, in the order thus recommended, he appointed courts, or meetings, for discipline, as the Quakers call them, with the approbation of the Society, where the case of the disorderly should be considered, if it should be brought to the cognisance of the church; and where a record should be kept of the proceedings of the Society respecting it. In these courts, or meetings, the poor were to have an equal voice with the rich. There was to be no distinction but in favor of religious worth. And here it is to be remarked, that he was so desirous that the most righteous judgment should be pronounced upon any offender, that he abandoned the usual mode of decision, in general so highly valued, by a majority of voices, and recommended the decision to be made according to the apparent will of the virtuous who might be present. And as expulsion from membership with the church was to be considered as the heaviest punishment which the Quakers, as a religious

* Matthew, xviii, 15, 16, 17.

body, could inflict, he gave the offender an opportunity of appealing to meetings, different from those in which the sentence had been pronounced against him, and where the decisive voices were again to be collected from the preponderant weight of religious character.

He introduced, also, into his system of discipline, privileges in favor of women, which marked his sense of justice, and the strength and liberality of his mind. The men he considered undoubtedly as the heads of the church, and from whom all laws concerning it ought to issue. But he did not deny women on that account any power, which he thought it would be proper for them to hold. He believed them to be capable of great usefulness, and therefore admitted them to the honor of being, in his own Society, of nearly equal importance with the men. In the general duty, imposed upon members, of watching over one another, he laid it upon the women to be particularly careful in observing the morals of those of their own sex. He gave them meetings for discipline of their own, with the power of recording their own transactions, so that women were to act among courts or meetings of women, as men among those of men. There was also to be no office in the Society belonging to the men but he advised there should be a corresponding one belonging to the women. By this new and impartial step he raised the women of his own community beyond the level of women in others, and laid the foundation of that improved strength of intellect, dignity of mind, capability of business, and habit of humane offices, which are so conspicious among female Quakers at the present day.

With respect to the numerous offices, belonging to the discipline, he laid it down as a principle, that the persons, who were to fill them, were to have no other emolument or reward, than that, which a faithful discharge of them would bring to their own consciences.

These are the general outlines of the system of discipline, as introduced by George Fox. This system was carried into execution, as he himself had formed it, in his own time. Additions, however, have been made to it since, as it seemed proper, by the Society at large. In the time of George Fox it was laid upon every member, as we have seen, to watch over his neighbor for his spiritual welfare. But, in 1698, the Society conceiving that what was the business of every one might eventually become the business of no one, they appointed officers, whose particular duty it should be to be overseers of the morals of individuals; thus hoping that by the general vigilance enjoined by George Fox, which was still to continue, and by the particular vigilance then appointed, sufficient care would be taken of the morals of the whole body. In the time, again, of George Fox, women had only their monthly and quarterly meetings

for discipline, but it has since been determined that they should have their yearly meetings equally with the men. In the time, again, of George Fox, none but the grave members were admitted into the meetings of discipline; but it has since been agreed that young persons should have the privilege of attending them; and this, I believe, upon the notion, that while these meetings would qualify them for transacting the business of the Society, they might operate as schools for virtue.

This system of discipline, as thus introduced by George Fox, and thus enlarged by the Society afterwards, has not escaped, notwithstanding the loveliness of its theory, the censure of the world.

It has been considered, in the first place, as a system of espionage, by which one member is made a spy upon, or becomes an informer against, another. But against this charge it would be observed by the Quakers, that vigilance over morals is unquestionably a Christian duty. It would be observed again, that the vigilance, which is exercised in this case, is not with the intention of mischief, as in the case of spies and informers, but with the intention of good. It is not to obtain money, but to preserve reputation and virtue. It is not to persecute, but to reclaim. It is not to make a man odious, but to make him more respectable. It is never an interference with innocence. The watchfulness begins to be offensive only where delinquency is begun.

The discipline, again, has been considered as too great an infringement of the liberty of those who are brought under it. Against this the Quakers would contend, that all persons, who live in civil society, must give up a portion of their freedom, that more happiness and security may be enjoyed. So, when men enter into Christian societies, they must part with a little of their liberty for their moral good.

But whatever may be the light in which persons, not of the Society, may view this institution, those, belonging to it, submit to, and respect it. It is possible there may be some, who may feel it a restraint upon their conduct: and there is no doubt that it is a restraint upon those, who have irregular desires to gratify, or destructive pleasures to pursue. But, generally speaking, the youth of the Society, who receive a consistent education, approve of it. Genuine Quaker-parents, as I have had occasion to observe, insist upon the subjugation of the will. It is their object to make their children lowly, patient, and submissive. They, therefore, who are born in the Society, are born under the system, and are in general educated for it. They, who become converted to the religion of the Society, know beforehand the terms of their admission. And it

will appear to all to be at least an equitable institution, because, in the administration of it, there is no exception of persons. The officers themselves, who are appointed to watch over, fall under the inspection of the discipline. The poor may admonish the rich, and the rich the poor. There is no exception, in short, either for age, or sex, or station.

It is not necessary, at least in the present place, that I should go further, and rake up all the objections that may be urged upon this subject. I shall therefore only observe here, that the discipline of the Quakers, notwithstanding all its supposed imperfections, whatever they may be, is the grand foundation-stone, upon which their moral education is supported. It is a great partition-wall between them and vice. If this part of the fabric were ever allowed to be undermined, the building would fall to pieces; and though the members of this Society might still be known by their apparel and their language, they would no longer be so remarkable, as they are now generally confessed to be, for their moral character.

SECTION II.

Manner of the administration of the discipline of the Quakers—Overseers appointed to every particular meeting—Manner of reclaiming an individual—first, by admonition—this sometimes successful—secondly, by dealing—this sometimes successful—but, if unsuccessful, the offender is disowned—but he may appeal afterwards to two different courts or meetings for redress.

Having now given the general outlines of the Discipline of the Society, I shall proceed to explain the particular manner of the Administration of it.

To administer it effectually, all individuals of the Society, as I have just stated, whether men or women, are allowed the power of watching over the conduct of one another for their good, and of interfering, if they should see occasion.

But, besides this general care, two or more persons, of age and experience, and of moral lives and character, and two or more women of a similar description, are directed to be appointed to have the oversight of every congregation or particular meeting in the kingdom. These persons are called Overseers, because it is their duty to oversee their respective flocks.

If any of the members should violate the prohibitions mentioned in the former part of the work, or should become chargeable with injustice, or drunkenness, or profane swearing, or neglect of public worship, or should act in any way inconsistently with his character as a Christian,—it becomes the particular duty of these overseers, though it is also the duty of the members at large, to visit him in

private, to set before him the error and consequences of his conduct, and to endeavor by all the means in their power to reclaim him. This act, on the part of the overseer, is termed by the Society—Admonishing. The circumstances of admonishing, and of being admonished, are known only to the parties, except the case should have become of itself notorious; for secrecy is held sacred on the part of the persons who admonish. Hence it may happen that several of the Society may admonish the same person, though no one of them knows that any other has been visiting him at all. The offender may be thus admonished by overseers, and other individuals, for weeks and months together; for no time is fixed by the Society, and no pains are supposed to be spared, for his reformation. It is expected, however, in all such admonitions, that no austerity of language or manner should be used, but that he should be admonished in tenderness and love.

If an overseer, or any other individual, after having thus labored to reclaim another for a considerable length of time, finds that he has not succeeded in his work, and feels also that he despairs of succeeding by his own efforts, he opens the matter to some other overseer, or to one or more serious members, and requests their aid. These persons now wait upon the offender together, and unite their efforts in endeavoring to persuade him to amend his life. This act, which now becomes more public by the junction of two or three in the work of his reformation, is still kept a secret from other individuals of the Society, and still retains the name of—Admonishing.

It frequently happens that, during the different admonitions, the offender sees his error, and corrects his conduct. The visitations of course cease, and he goes on in the estimation of his brethren as a regular or unoffending member, no one knowing but the admonishing persons that he has been under the discipline of the Society. I may observe here, that what is done by men to men is done by women to women,—the women admonishing, and trying to reclaim, those of their own sex in the same manner.

Should, however, the overseers, and other persons before mentioned, find, after a proper length of time, that all their united efforts have been ineffectual, and that they have no hope of success with respect to his amendment, they lay the case, if it should be of a serious nature, before a court, which has the name of a Monthly Meeting*. This court, or meeting, makes a minute of the case, and

* Certain acts of delinquency are reported to the monthly meeting, as soon as the truth of the facts can be ascertained; such as gross immoralities, public insolvencies, and a violation of the rules of the Society with respect to marriage, payment of tithes, &c.

appoints a committee to visit him. The committee, in consequence of their appointment, wait upon him. This act is now considered as a public act, or as an act of the church. It is not now termed Admonishing, but changes its name to Dealing*. The offender, too, while the committee are dealing with him, though he may attend the meetings of the Society for worship, does not attend those for their discipline. If the committee, after having dealt with the offender according to their appointment, should be satisfied that he is sensible of his error, they make a report to the monthly court or meeting concerning him. A minute is then drawn up, in which it is stated that he has made satisfaction for the offence. It sometimes happens that he himself sends to ths same meeting a written acknowledgment of his error. From this time he attends the meetings for discipline again, and is continued in the Society as if nothing improper had taken place; nor is any one allowed to reproach him for his former faults.

Should, however, all endeavours prove ineffectual, and should the committee, after having duly laboured with the offender, consider him at last as incorrigible, they report their proceedings to the monthly meeting. He is then publicly excluded from membership, or, as it is called, Disowned.† This is done by a distinct document, called a Testimony of Disownment, in which the nature of the offence, and the means, that have been used to reclaim him, are described. A wish is also generally expressed in this document, that he may repent, and be taken into membership again. A copy of this minute is always required to be given to him.

If the offender should consider this act of disowning him as an unjust proceeding, he may appeal to a higher tribunal, or to a quarterly court or meeting. This quarterly court or meeting then appoints a committee, of which no one of the monthly meeting that condemned him can be a member, to reconsider his case. Should this committee report, and the quarterly meeting in consequence decide against him, he may appeal to the yearly. This latter meeting is held in London, and consists of deputies and others from all parts of the kingdom. The yearly meeting then appoints a committee of twelve deputies, taken from twelve quarterly meetings, none of whom can be from the quarterly meeting that passed sentence against him, to examine his case again. If this committee

* Women though they may admonish, cannot deal with, women, this being an act of the church, till they have consulted the meetings of the men. Men are generally joined with women in the commission for this purpose.

† Women cannot disown; the power of disowning, as an act of the church, being vested in the meetings of the men.

should confirm the former decisions, he may appeal to the yearly meeting at large: beyond this there is no appeal. But if he should even be disowned by the voice of the yearly meeting at large, he may, if he live to give satisfactory proof of his amendment, and sue for readmission into the Society, be received into membership again; but he can only be received through the medium of the monthly meeting, by which he was first disowned.

SECTION III.

Two charges usually brought against this administration of the discipline—first, that it is managed with an authoritative spirit—secondly, that it is managed partially—These charges considered.

As two charges are usually brought against the administration of that part of the discipline, which has been just explained, I shall consider them in this place.

The first usually is, that, though the Quakers abhor what they call the authority of priestcraft, yet some overseers possess a portion of the spirit of ecclesiastical dominion; that they are austere, authoritative, and overbearing in the course of the exercise of their office; and that, though the institution may be of Christian origin, it is not always conducted by these with a Christian spirit. To this first charge I shall make the following reply:

That there may be individual instances, where this charge is well founded, I am neither disposed nor qualified to deny. Overseers have their different tempers, like other people; and the exercise of dominion has unquestionably a tendency to spoil the heart. So far there is an opening for the admission of this charge. But it must be observed, on the other hand, that the persons to be chosen overseers are to be, by the laws of the Society,* "as upright and unblamable in their conversation as they can be found, in order that the advice, which they shall occasionally administer to other Friends, may be the better received, and carry with it the greater weight and force on the minds of those, whom they shall be concerned to admonish." It must be observed again, that it is expressly enjoined them, that "they are to exercise their functions in a meek, calm, and peaceable spirit, in order that the admonished may see that their interference with their conduct proceeds from a principle of love, and a regard for their good, and preservation in the truth." And it must be observed again, that any violation of this injunction would render them liable to be admonished by others, and to come under the discipline themselves.

---

* Book of Extracts.

The second charge is, that the discipline is administered partially; that more favor is shown to the rich than to the poor; and that the latter are sooner disowned than the former for the same faults.

This latter charge has probably arisen from a vulgar notion, that, as the poor are supported by the Society, there is a general wish to get rid of them. But this notion is not true. There is more than ordinary caution in disowning those, who are objects of support. Add to which, that as some of the most orderly members of the body are to be found among the poor, an expulsion of these, in a hasty manner, would be a dimunition of the quantum of respectability, or of the quantum of moral character, of the Society at large.

In examining this charge, it must certainly be allowed, that, though the principle of "no respect of persons" is no where carried to a greater length than in the Quaker Society, yet we may reasonably expect to find a drawback from the full operation of it in a variety of causes. We are all of us too apt, in the first place, to look up to the rich, but to look down upon the poor. We are apt to court the good will of the former, when we seem to care very little even if we offend the latter. The rich themselves, and the middle classes of men, respect the rich more than the poor, and the poor show more respect to the rich than to one another. Hence it is possible that a poor man may find more reluctance in entering the doors of a rich man to admonish him, than one who is rich to enter the doors of the poor for the same purpose. Men, again, though they may be equally good, may not have all the same strength of character. Some overseers may be more timid than others, and this timidity may operate upon them more in the execution of their duty upon one class of individuals than upon another. Hence, a rich man may escape for a longer time without admonition than a poorer member. But when the ice is once broken,—when admonition is once begun,—when respectable persons have been called in by overseers or others,—those causes, which might be preventive of justice, will decrease; and, if the matter should be carried to a monthly or a quarterly meeting, they will wholly vanish. For, in these courts, it is a truth, that they, who are the most irreproachable for their lives, and the most likely of course to decide justly on any occasion, are the most attended to, or carry the most weight, when they speak publicly. Now these are to be found principally in the low and middle classes; which, in all societies, contain the greater number of individuals. As to the very rich, they are few indeed, compared with the rest; and these may be subdivided into two classes, for the further elucidation of the point. The first will consist of men, who rigidly follow the rules of the Society, and are as

exemplary as the very best of the members. The second will consist of those, who are members according to the letter, but not according to the spirit, and who are content with walking in the shadow that follows the substance of the body. Those of the first class will do justice, and they will have an equal influence with any. Those of the second, whatever may be their riches, or whatever they may say, are seldom, if ever, attended to in the administration of the discipline.

From hence it will appear, that if there be any partiality in the administration of this institution, it will consist principally in this,—that a rich man may be suffered, in particular cases, to go longer without admonition than a poorer member, but that, after admonition had been begun, justice will be impartially administered; and that the charge of a preference, where disowning is concerned, has no solid foundation for its support.

SECTION IV.

Three great principles discoverable in the discipline, as hitherto explained—these applicable to the discipline of larger societies, or to the criminal codes of states—lamentable that, as Christian principles, they have not been admitted into our own—Quakers, as far as they have had influence in legislation, have adopted them—Exertions of William Penn—Legislature of Pennsylvania an example to other countries in this particular.

I find it almost impossible to proceed to the great courts or meetings of the Society, which I had allotted for my next subject, without stopping awhile to make a few observations on the principles of that part of the discipline, which I have now explained.

It may be observed, first, that the great object of this part of the discipline is the reformation of the offending person. Secondly, that the means of effecting this object consists of religious instruction and advice. And, thirdly, that no pains are to be spared, and no time to be limited, for the trial of these means; or, in other words, that nothing is to be left undone, while there is a hope that the offender may be reclaimed. Now these principles the Quakers adopt in the exercise of their discipline, because, as a Christian community, they believe they ought to be guided only by Christian principles, and they know of no other, which the letter or the spirit of Christianity can warrant.

I shall trespass upon the patience of the reader in this place, only till I have made an application of these principles, or till I have shown him how far these might be extended, and extended with advantage to morals, beyond the limits of the Quaker Society, by

being received as the basis, upon which a system of penal laws might be founded among larger societies or states.

It is much to be lamented that nations professing Christianity should have lost sight, in their various acts of legislation, of Christian principles, or that they should not have interwoven some such beautiful principles as those, which we have seen adopted by the Quakers, into the system of their penal laws. But if this negligence or omission would appear worthy of regret, if reported of any Christian nation, it would appear most so if reported of our own, where one would suppose that the advantages of civil and religious liberty, and those of a reformed religion, would have had their influence in the correction of our judgments, and in the benevolent dispositions of our will. And yet nothing is more true than that these good influences have either never been produced, or, if produced, that they have never been attended to upon this subject. There seems to be no provision for religious instruction in our numerous prisons. We seem to make no patient trials of those, who are confined in them, for their reformation; but, on the other hand, we seem to hurry them off the stage of life, by means of a code which annexes death to two hundred different offences, as if we had allowed our laws have been written by the bloody pen of the pagan Draco. And it seems remarkable that this system should be persevered in, when we consider that death, as far as the experiment has been made in our own country, has little or no effect as a punishment for crimes. Forgery, and the circulation of forged paper, and the counterfeiting of the money of the realm, are capital offences, and are never pardoned. And yet no offences are more frequently committed than these. And it seems still more remarkable when we consider, in addition to this, that, in consequence of the experiments made in other countries, it seems to be approaching fast to an axiom, that crimes are less frequent in proportion as mercy takes the place of severity, or as there are judicious substitutes for the punishment of death.

I shall not inquire, in this place, how far the right of taking away life on many occasions, which is sanctioned by the law of the land, can be supported on the ground of justice, or how far a greater injury is done by it than the injury the criminal has himself done. As Christians, it seems that we should be influenced by Christian principles. Now, nothing can be more true, than that Christianity commands us to be tender-hearted one to another, to have a tender forbearance one with another, and to regard one another as brethren. We are taught also that men, independently of their accountableness to their own governments, are accountable for their actions in a future state,

and that punishments are unquestionably to follow. But where are our forbearance and our love,—where is our regard for the temporal and eternal interests of man,—where is our respect for the principles of the Gospel,—if we make the reformation of a criminal a less object than his punishment; or if we consign him to death in the midst of his sins, without having tried all the means in our power for his recovery?

Had the Quakers been the legislators of the world, they had long ago interwoven the principles of their discipline into their penal codes, and death had been long ago abolished as a punishment for crimes. As far as they have had any power with legislatures, they have procured an attention to these principles. George Fox remonstrated with the judges in his time on the subject of capital punishments. But the Quakers having been few in number, compared with the rest of their countrymen, and having had no seats in the legislature, and no predominant interest with the members of it, they have been unable to effect any change in England on this subject. In Pennsylvania, however, where they were the original colonists, they have had influence with their own government, and they have contributed to set up a model of jurisprudence worthy of the imitation of the world.

William Penn, on his arrival in America, formed a code of laws chiefly on Quaker-principles, in which, however, death was inscribed as a punishment, but it was confined to murder. Queen Anne set this code aside, and substituted the statute and common law of the mother country. It was, however, resumed in time, and acted upon for some years; when it was set aside by the mother country again. From this time it continued dormant till the separation of America from England. But no sooner had this event taken place, which rendered the American states their own legislators, than the Pennsylvanian Quakers began to aim at obtaining an alteration of the penal laws. In this they were joined by worthy individuals of other denominations. And these, acting in union, procured from the legislature of Pennsylvania, in the year 1786, a reform of the criminal code. This reform, however, was not carried, in the opinion of the Society, to a sufficient length. Accordingly they took the lead again, and exerted themselves afresh upon this subject. Many of them formed themselves into a committee for alleviating the miseries of public prisons. Other persons co-operated with them in this undertaking also. At length, after great perseverance, they prevailed upon the same legislature, in the year 1790, to try an ameliorated system. This trial answered so well, that the same legislature again, in the year 1794, established an act, in which several

Quaker-principles were incorporated, and in which only the crime of premeditated murder was punishable with death.

As there is now but one capital offence in Pennsylvania, punishments for other offences are made up of fine, and imprisonment, and labour; and these are awarded separately or conjointly, according to the magnitude of the crime.

When criminals have been convicted, and sent to the great gaol of Philadelphia to undergo their punishment, it is expected of them that they should maintain themselves out of their daily labour; that they should pay for their board and washing, and also for the use of their different implements of labour; and that they should defray the expenses of their commitment, and of their prosecutions and their trials. An account, therefore, is regularly kept against them. And if, at the expiration of the term of their punishment, there should be a surplus of money in their favour, arising out of the produce of their work, it is given to them on their discharge.

An agreement is usually made about the price of prison-labor between the inspector of the gaol and the employers of the criminals.

As reformation is now the great object in Pennsylvania, where offences have been committed, it is of the first importance that the gaoler and the different inspectors should be persons of moral character. Good example, religious advice, and humane treatment, on the part of these, will have a tendency to produce attention, respect, and love on the part of the prisoners, and to influence their moral conduct. Hence it is a rule, never to be departed from, that none are to be chosen as successors to these different officers but such as shall be found on inquiry to have been exemplary in their lives.

As reformation, again, is now the great object, no corporal punishment is allowed in the prison; no keeper can strike a criminal; nor can any criminal be put into irons. All such punishments are considered as doing harm. They tend to extirpate a sense of shame. They tend to degrade a man, and to make him consider himself as degraded in his own eyes: whereas it it the design of this change in the penal system, that he should be constantly looking up to the restoration of his dignity as a man, and to the recovery of his moral character.

As reformation, again, is now the great object, the following system is adopted*: No intercourse is allowed between the males and

* As cleanliness is connected with health, and health with morals, the prisoners are obliged to wash and clean themselves every morning before their work, and to bathe, in the summer season, in a large reservoir of water, which is provided in the court-yard of the prison for this purpose.

the females, nor any between the untried and the convicted prisoners. While they are engaged in their labor, they are allowed to talk only upon the subject which immediately relates to their work. All unnecessary conversation is forbidden. Profane swearing is never overlooked. A strict watch is kept that no spirituous liquors may be introduced. Care is taken that all the prisoners have the benefit of religious instruction. The prison is accordingly open at stated times to the pastors of the different religious denominations of the place. And as the mind of man may be worked upon by rewards as well as by punishments, a hope is held out to the prisoners, that the time of their confinement may be shortened by their good behavior. For the inspectors, if they have reason to believe that a solid reformation has taken place in any individual, have a power of interceding for his enlargement, and the executive government of granting it, if they think it proper. In cases, where the prisoners are refractory, they are usually put into solitary confinement, and deprived of the opportunity of working. During this time the expenses of their board and washing are going on; so that they are glad to get into employment again, that they may liquidate the debt, which, since the suspension of their labor, has been accruing to the gaol.

In consequence of these regulations, they, who visit the criminals in Philadelphia in the hours of their labor, have more an idea of a large manufactory than of a prison. They see nail-makers, sawyers, carpenters, joiners, weavers and others, all busily employed. They see regularity and order among these. And as no chains are to be seen in the prison, they seem to forget their situation as criminals, and to look upon them as the free and honest laborers of a community following their respective trades.

In consequence of these regulations, great advantages have arisen both to the criminals and to the state. The state has experienced a diminution of crimes to the amount of one-half since the change of the penal system; and the criminals have been restored, in a great proportion, from the gaol to the community, as reformed persons; for few have been known to stay the whole term of their confinement. But no person could have had any of his time remitted him, except he had been considered, both by the inspectors and the executive government, as deserving it. This circumstance of permission to leave the prison, before the time expressed in the sentence, is of great importance to the prisoners; for it operates as a certificate for them of their amendment to the world at large. Hence, no stigma is attached to them for having been the inhabitants of a prison. It may be observed, also, that some of the most orderly

and industrious, and such as have worked at the most profitable trades, have had sums of money to take on their discharge, by which they have been able to maintain themselves honestly, till they could get into employ.

Such is the state, and such the manner of the execution, of the penal laws of Pennsylvania, as founded upon Quaker-principles. So happy have the effects of this new system already been, that it is supposed that it will be adopted by the other American states. May the example be universally followed! May it be universally received as a truth, that true policy is inseparable from virtue; that in proportion as principles become lovely on account of their morality, they will become beneficial when acted upon, both to individuals and to states; or that legislators cannot raise a constitution upon so fair and firm a foundation as upon the Gospel of Jesus Christ!

CHAPTER II.

Monthly court or meeting—Constitution of this meeting—Each county is usually divided into parts—In each of these parts or divisions are several meeting-houses, which have their several congregations attached to them—One meeting-house in each division is fixed upon for transacting the business of all the congregations in that division—Deputies appointed from every particular meeting or congregation in each division to the place fixed upon for transacting the business within it—Nature of the business to be transacted—Women become deputies, and transact business equally with the men.

I come, after this long digression, to the courts of the Quakers. And here I shall immediately premise, that I profess to do little more than to give a general outline of these. I do not intend to explain the proceedings preparatory to the meetings there, or to state exceptions from general rules, or to trouble the memory of the reader with more circumstances than will be sufficient to enable him to have a general idea of this part of the discipline of the Society.

The Quakers manage their discipline by means of monthly, quarterly, and yearly courts, to which, however, they themselves uniformly give the name of Meetings.

To explain the nature and business of the monthly or first of these meetings, I shall fix upon some county in my own mind, and describe the business that is usually done in this in the course of the month. For as the business, which is usually transacted in any one county, is done by the Quakers in the same manner and in the same month

in another, the reader, by supposing an aggregate of counties, may easily imagine how the whole business of the Society is done for the whole kingdom.

The Quakers usually divide a county into a number of parts, according to the Quaker-population of it*. In each of these divisions there are usually several meeting-houses, and these have their several congregations attached to them. One meeting-house, however, in each division is usually fixed upon for transacting the business of all the congregations that are within it, and for the holding of these monthly courts. The different congregations of the Quakers, or the members of the different particular meetings, which are settled in the northern part of the county, are attached of course to the meeting-house which has been fixed upon in the northern division of it, because it gives them the least trouble to repair to it on this occasion. The members of those, again, which are settled in the southern, or central, or other parts of the county, are attached to that which has been fixed upon in the southern, or central, or other divisions of it, for the same reason. The different congregations in the northern division of the county appoint, each of them, a set of deputies once a month, which deputies are of both sexes, to repair to the meeting-house which has been thus assigned them. The different congregations in the southern, central, or other divisions, appoint also, each of them, others, to repair to that which has been assigned them in like manner. These deputies are all of them previously instructed in the matters belonging to the congregations, which they respectively represent.

At length the day arrives for the monthly meeting. The deputies make ready to execute the duties committed to their trust. They repair, each set of them, to their respective places of meeting. Here a number of Quakers, of different ages and of both sexes, from their different divisions, repair also. It is expected that all who can conveniently attend should be present on this occasion.

When they are collected at the meeting-house, which was said to have been fixed upon in each division, a meeting for worship takes place. All persons, both men and women, attend together. But when this meeting is over, they separate into different apartments for the purposes of the discipline; the men, to transact by themselves the business of the men, and of their own district; the women, to transact that which is more limited, namely, such as belongs to their own sex.

* This was the ancient method, when the Society was numerous in every county of the kingdom; and the principle is still followed according to existing circumstances.

In the men's meeting, (and it is the same in the women's) the names of the deputies before mentioned are first entered in a book; for until this takes place the meeting for discipline is not considered to be constituted.

The minutes of the last monthly meeting are then generally read; by which it is seen if any business of the Society was left unfinished. Should any thing of this sort occur, it becomes the first object to be considered and dispatched*.

The new business, in which the deputies were said to have been previously instructed by the congregations which they represented, comes on. This business may be of various sorts. One part of it uniformly relates to the poor. The wants of these are provided for, and the education of their children taken care of, at this meeting. Presentations of marriages are received; and births, marriages, and funerals are registered. If disorderly members, after long and repeated admonitions, should have given no hopes of amendment, their case is first publicly cognisable in this court. Committees are appointed to visit, advise, and try to reclaim them. Persons reclaimed by these visitations are restored to membership, after having been well reported of by the parties deputed to visit them. The fitness of persons applying for membership from other Societies is examined here. Answers, also, are prepared to the queries† at the proper time. Instructions also are given, if necessary, to particular meetings belonging to it, suited to the exigencies of their cases; and certificates are granted to members on various occasions.

In transacting this and other business of the Society, all members present are allowed to speak. The poorest man in the meeting-house, though he may be receiving charitable contributions at the time, is entitled to deliver his sentiments upon any point. He may bring forward new matter. He may approve or object to what others have proposed before him. No person may interrupt him while he speaks. The youth, who are sitting by, are gaining a knowledge of the affairs and discipline of the Society, and are gradually acquiring sentiments and habits that are to mark their character in life. They learn, in the first place, the duty of a benevolent and respectful consideration for the poor. In hearing the different cases argued and discussed, they learn in some measure the rudiments of justice, and imbibe opinions of the necessity of moral conduct. In these courts they learn to reason. They learn also to hear others patiently, and without interruption, and to transact any

* The London monthly meetings begin differently from those in the country.

† These queries will be explained in the next chapter.

business, that may come before them in maturer years, with regularity and order.

I cannot omit to mention here the orderly manner, in which the Quakers conduct their business on these occasions. When a subject is brought before them it is canvassed, to the exclusion of all extraneous matter, till some conclusion results. The clerk of the monthly meeting then draws up a minute, containing, as nearly as he can collect, the substance of this conclusion. This minute is then read aloud to the auditory, and either stands, or undergoes an alteration, as appears by the silence or discussion upon it to be the sense of the meeting. When fully agreed upon, it stands ready to be recorded. When a second subject comes on, it is canvassed, and a minute is made of it, to be recorded in the same manner, before a third is allowed to be introduced. Thus each point is settled, till the whole business of the meeting is concluded.

I may now mention that, in the same manner as the men proceed in their apartment on this occasion, the women proceed in their own apartment or meeting also. There are women-deputies and women-clerks. They enter the names of these deputies, read the minutes of the last monthly meeting, bring forward the new matter, and deliberate and argue on the affairs of their own sex. They record their proceedings equally. The young females, also, are present, and have similar opportunities of gaining knowledge, of improving their judgments, and of acquiring useful and moral habits, as the young men.

It is usual, when the women have finished the business of their own meeting, to send one of their members to the apartment of the men, to know if they have any thing to communicate. This messenger having returned, and every thing having been settled and recorded in both meetings, the monthly meeting is over, and men, women, and youth of both sexes, return to their respective homes.

In the same manner as the different congregations or members of the different meetings in any one division of the county meet together, and transact their monthly business, so other different congregations belonging to other divisions of the same county meet at other appointed places, and dispatch their business also. And in the same manner as the business is thus done in one county, it is done in every other county of the kingdom once a month.

CHAPTER III.

Quarterly court or meeting—Constitution of this meeting—One place in each county is now fixed upon for the transaction of business—this place may be different in the different quarters of the year—Deputies from the various monthly meetings are appointed to repair to this place—Nature of the business to be transacted—Certain queries proposed—written answers carried to these by the deputies just mentioned—Queries proposed in the women's meeting also, and answered in the same manner.

The quarterly meeting of the Society, which comes next in order, is much more numerously attended than the monthly. The monthly, as we have just seen, superintended the concerns of a few congregations or particular meetings, which were contained in a small division of the county. The quarterly meeting, on the other hand, superintends the concerns of all the monthly meetings in the county at large. It takes cognisance of course of the concerns of a greater portion of population, and, as the name implies, for a greater extent of time. The Quaker population of a whole county* is now to assemble in one place. This place, however, is not always the same. It may be different, to accommodate the members in their turn, in the different quarters of the year.

In the same manner as the different congregations in a small division of a county have been shown to have sent deputies to the respective monthly meetings within it, so the different monthly meetings in the same county send, each of them, deputies to the quarterly. Two or more of each sex are generally deputed from each meeting. These deputies are supposed to have understood, at the monthly meeting where they were chosen, all the matters which the discipline required them to know relative to the state and condition of their constituents. Furnished with this knowledge, and instructed moreover by written documents on a variety of subjects, they repair at the proper time to the place of meeting. All the members, in the district in question, who are expected to go, bend their direction hither. Any person travelling in the county at this time would see an unusual number of Quakers upon the road, directing their journey to the same point. Those, who live farthest from the place where the meeting is held, have often a long journey

*I still adhere, to give the reader a clearer idea of the discipline, and to prevent confusion, to the division by county, though the district in question may not always comprehend a complete county.

to perform. They are frequently out two or three whole days, and sometimes longer, upon this occasion. But as this sort of meeting takes place but once in the quarter, the loss of their time, and the fatigue of their journey, and the expenses attending it, are borne cheerfully.

When all of them are assembled, nearly the same custom obtains at the quarterly as has been described at the monthly meeting. A meeting for worship is first held. The men and women, when this is over, separate into their different apartments; after which, the meeting for discipline begins in each.

I shall not detail the different kinds of business, which come on at this meeting. I shall explain the principal subject only.

The Society at large have agreed upon a number of questions, or queries as they call them, which they have committed to print, and which they expect to be read and answered in the course of these quarterly meetings. The following is a list of them:

I. Are meetings for worship and discipline kept up, and do Friends attend them duly, and at the time appointed; and do they avoid all unbecoming behavior therein?

II. Is there among you any growth in the truth; and hath any convincement appeared since last year?

III. Are preserved in love towards each other; if differences arise, is due care taken speedily to end them; and are Friends careful to avoid and discourage tale-bearing and detraction?

IV. Do Friends endeavor, by example and precept, to train up their children, servants, and those under their care, in a religious life and conversation, consistent with our Christian profession, in the frequent reading of the holy Scriptures, and in plainness of speech, behavior and apparel?

V. Are Friends just in their dealings, and punctual in fulfilling their engagements; and are they annually advised carefully to inspect the state of their affairs once in the year?

VI. Are Friends careful to avoid all vain sports and places of diversion, gaming, all unnecessary frequenting of taverns and other public houses, excess in drinking, and other intemperance?

VII. Do Friends bear a faithful and Christian testimony against receiving and paying tithes, priests' demands, and those called church-rates?

VIII. Are friends faithful in our testimony against bearing arms, and being in any manner concerned in the militia, in privateers, letters of marque, or armed vessels, or dealing in prize-goods?

IX. Are Friends clear of defrauding the King of his customs, duties, and excise, and of using or dealing in goods suspected to be run?

X. Are the necessities of the poor among you properly inspected and relieved; and is good care taken of the education of their offspring?

XI. Have any meetings been settled, discontinued, or united, since last year?

XII. Are there any Friends prisoners for our testimonies; and if any one hath died a prisoner, or been discharged, since last year, when and how?

XIII. Is early care taken to admonish such as appear inclinable to marry in a manner contrary to the rules of our Society; and to deal with such as persist in refusing to take counsel?

XIV. Have you two or more faithful Friends, appointed by the monthly meeting, as overseers in each particular meeting; are the rules respecting removals duly observed; and is due care taken, when anything appears amiss, that the rules of our discipline be timely and impartially put in practice?

XV. Do you keep a record of the prosecutions and sufferings of your members; is due care taken to register all marriages, births, and burials; are the titles of your meeting-houses, burial-grounds, &c., duly preserved and recorded; and are all legacies and donations properly secured, and recorded, and duly applied?

These are the questions, which the Society expect should be publicly asked and answered in their quarterly courts or meetings. Some of these are to be answered in one quarterly meeting, and others* in another; and all of them in the course of the year.

The clerk of the quarterly meeting, when they come to this part of the business, reads the first of the appointed queries to the members present, and is then silent. Soon after this, a deputy from one of the monthly meetings comes forward, and producing the written documents or answers to the queries, all of which were prepared at the meeting where he was chosen, reads that document, which contains a reply to the first query in behalf of the meeting he represents. A deputy from a second monthly meeting then comes forward, and produces the written documents also, and answers the same query in behalf of his own meeting in the same manner. A deputy from a third, where there are more than two meetings, then produces the documents in his turn, and replies to it also. And this mode is observed, till the deputies from each of the monthly meetings in the county have answered the first query.

---

*The Quakers consider the punctual attendance of their religious meetings, the preservation of love among them, and the care of the poor, of such particular importance, that they require the first, third, and tenth to be answered every quarter.

When the first query has been thus fully answered, silence is observed through the whole court. Members present have now an opportunity of making any observations they may think proper. If it should appear by the answers to this first query, that there is a departure from principles on the subject it contains, in any of the monthly meetings which the deputies represent, it is noticed by any one present. The observations, made by one, frequently give rise to observations from another. Advice is sometimes ordered to be given, adapted to the nature of this departure from principles; and this advice is occasionally circulated through the medium of the different monthly meetings to the particular congregation where the deviation has taken place.

When the first query has been thus read by the clerk and answered by the deputies, and when observations have been made upon it and instructions given, as now described, a second query is read audibly; and the same process takes place, and similar observations are sometimes made, and instructions given.

In the same manner a third query is read by the clerk, and answered by all the deputies, and observed upon by the meeting at large; and so on a fourth and a fifth, till all the queries, set apart for the day, are answered.

It may be proper now to observe, that while the men in their own meeting-house are thus transacting the quarterly business for themselves, the women, in a different apartment or meeting-house, are conducting it also for their own sex. They read, answer, and observe upon the queries in the same manner. When they have settled their own business, they send one or two of their members, as they did in the case of the monthly meeting, to the apartment of the men, to know if they have anything to communicate to them. When the business is finished in both meetings, they break up, and prepare for their respective homes.

CHAPTER IV.

Great yearly court, or meeting—Constitution of this meeting—One place only of meeting fixed upon for the whole kingdom—this the metropolis—Deputies appointed to it from the quarterly meetings—Business transacted at this meeting—Matters decided not by the influence of numbers, but by the weight of religious character—No head or chairman of this meeting—Character of this discipline or government of the Quakers—The laws relating to it better obeyed than those under any other discipline or government—Reasons of this obedience.

In the order, in which I have hitherto mentioned the meetings for the discipline of the Quakers, we have seen them rising by regular

ascent, both in importance and power. We have seen each in due progression comprising the action of a greater population than the foregoing, and for a greater period of time. I come now to the yearly meeting, which is possessed of a higher and wider jurisdiction than any that have been yet described. This meeting does not take cognisance of the conduct of particular or of monthly meetings, but at one general view, of the state and conduct of the members of each quarterly meeting, in order to form a judgment of the general state of the Society for the whole kingdom.

We saw, on a former occasion, the Quakers with their several deputies repairing to different places in a county; and we have seen them with their deputies again repairing to one great town in the different counties at large. We are now to see them repairing to the metropolis of the kingdom.

As deputies were chosen by each monthly meeting to represent it in the quarterly meeting, so the quarterly meetings choose deputies to represent them in the yearly meeting. These deputies are commissioned to be the bearers of certain documents to London, which contain answers in writing to a number of the queries mentioned in the last chapter*. These answers are made up from the answers received by the several quarterly meetings from their respective monthly meetings. Besides these, they are to carry with them other documents, among which are accounts of sufferings in consequence of a refusal of military service, and of the payment of the demands of the church.

The deputies, who are now generally four in number for each quarterly meeting, that is, four of each sex, (except for the quarterly meetings of York and London†, the former of which generally sends eight men and the latter twelve, and each of them the like number of females) having received their different documents, set forward on their journey. Besides these, many members of the Society repair to the metropolis. The distance of three or four hundred miles forms no impediment to the journey. A man cannot travel at this time but he sees the Quakers in motion from all parts, shaping their course to London, there to exercise, as will appear shortly, the power of deputies, judges, and legislators in turn, and to investigate and settle the affairs of the Society for the preceding year.

It may not be amiss to mention a circumstance, which has not unfrequently occurred upon these occasions. A Quaker, in low circumstances, but of unblemished life, has been occasionally chosen as

---

* Viz.—Numbers i, ii, iii, iv, vii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii.

† The quarterly meeting of London includes Middlesex.

one of the deputies to the metropolis, even for a county, where the Quaker-population has been considered to be rich. This deputy has scarcely been able, on account of the low state of his finances, to accomplish his journey, and has been known to travel on foot from distant parts. I mention this circumstance to prove that the Society, in its choice of representatives, shows no respect of persons, but that it pays, even in the persons of the poor, the respect that is due to virtue.

The day of the yearly meeting at length arrives. Whole days are now devoted to business, for which various committees are obliged to be appointed. The men, as before, retire to a meeting house allotted them to settle the business for the men and the Society at large; and the women retire to another, to settle that which belongs to their own sex. There are, nevertheless, at intervals, meetings for worship, at the several meeting-houses in the metropolis.

One great part of the business of the yearly meeting is to know the state of the Society in all its branches of discipline for the preceding year. This is known by hearing the answers brought to the queries from the several quarterly meetings, which are audibly read by the clerk, or his assistant, and are taken in rotation alphabetically. If any deficiency in the discipline should appear, by means of these documents, in any of the quarterly meetings, remarks follow on the part of the auditory, and written advices are ordered to be sent, if it should appear necessary; which are either of a general nature, or particularly directed to those, where the deficiency has been observed.

Another part of the business of the yearly meeting is to ascertain the amount of the money called "Friends' Sufferings," that is, of the money, or the value of the goods, that have been taken from different members for tithes* and church-dues; for the Society are principled against the maintenance of any religious ministry, and of course cannot conscientiously pay towards the support of the established church. In consequence of their refusal of payment in the latter case, their goods are seized by a law process, and sold to the best bidder. They, who have the charge of these executions, behave differently. Some wantonly take such goods as will not sell for a quarter of their value, and others much more than is necessary; and others, again, kindly select those, which in the sale will be attended with the least loss. This amount, arising from this confiscation of their property, is easily ascertained from the written answers of the

* Distraint or imprisonment for refusing to serve in the militia are included also under the head "Sufferings."

deputies. The sum for each county is observed and noted down. The different sums are then added together, and the amount for the whole kingdom within the year is discovered.

In speaking of tithes and church-dues, I must correct an error that is prevalent. It is usually understood, when individuals suffer on these accounts, that their losses are made up by the Society at large. Nothing can be more false than this idea. Were their losses made up on such occasions, there would be no suffering. The fact is, that whatever a person loses in this way is his own total loss; nor is it ever refunded, though, in consequence of expensive prosecutions at law, it has amounted to the whole of the property of those, who have refused the payment of these demands. If a man were to come to poverty on this account, he would undoubtedly be supported, but he would only be supported as belonging to the poor of the Society.

Among the subjects introduced at this meeting may be that of any new regulations for the government of the Society. The Quakers are not so blindly attached to antiquity, as to keep to customs, merely because they are of ancient date. But they are ready, on conviction, to change, alter, and improve. Such regulations or alterations may be, and sometimes are, proposed by individuals, except in cases of removals and settlements, when it is expected that they should come through the medium of one of the quarterly meetings.*

There is also a variety of other business at the yearly meeting. Reports are received and considered on the subject of Ackworth School, which was mentioned in a former part of this work as a public seminary of the Society.

Letters are also read from the branches of the Society in foreign parts, and answers prepared to them.

Appeals also are heard, in various instances, and determined in this court.

I may mention here two circumstances, that are worthy of notice on these occasions.

It may be observed that whether such business as that, which I have just detailed, or any of any other sort, comes before the yearly meeting at large, it is decided, not by the influence of numbers, but by the weight of religious character. As most subjects afford cause for a difference of opinion, so individuals at this meeting are found taking their different sides of the argument as they believe it right. Those, however, who are in opposition to any measure, if they per-

* The usual method, however, is for an individual to propose these to his own monthly meeting, and for this meeting, if they approve of them, to propose them to the quarterly, and then for the quarterly, in case of a similar approbation, to propose them to the yearly meeting.

ceive by the turn the debate takes, either that they are going against the general will, or that they are opposing the sentiments of members of high moral reputation in the Society, give way. And so far do they carry their condescension on these occasions, that if a few ancient and respectable individuals seem to be dissatisfied with any measure that may have been proposed, though otherwise respectably supported, the measure is frequently postponed, out of tenderness to the feelings of such members, and from a desire of gaining them in time by forbearance. But in whatever way the question before them is settled, no division is ever called for. No counting of numbers is allowed. No protest is suffered to be entered. In such a case there can be no ostensible leader of any party: no ostensible minority or majority. The Quakers are of opinion that such things, if allowed, would be inconsistent with their profession. They would lead, also, to broils and divisions, and ultimately to the detriment of the Society. Every measure, therefore, is settled by those who are present at this meeting in the way I have mentioned, in brotherly love, and, as the name of the Society signifies, as Friends.

The other remarkable circumstance is, that there is no ostensible president, or head,* of this great assembly, nor any ostensible president, or head, of any one of its committees; and yet the business of the Society is conducted in as orderly a manner as it is possible to be among any body of men, where the number is so great, and where every individual has a right to speak.

The state of the Society having by this time been ascertained, both in the meetings of the women and of the men, from the written answers of the different deputies, and from the reports of different committees, and the other business† of the meeting having been nearly finished, a committee, which had been previously chosen, meet to draw up a public letter.

This letter usually comprehends three subjects: first, the State of the Society, in which the sufferings for tithes and other demands of the church are included. This state, in all its different branches, the committees ascertain by inspecting the answers as brought by the deputies before mentioned.

A second subject, comprehended in the letter, is Advice to the Society for the Regulation of their moral aud civil Conduct. This advice is suggested partly from the same written answers, and partly by the circumstances of the times. Are there, for instance, any

*Christ is supposed by the Quakers to be the head, under whose guidance all their deliberations ought to take place.

†This may relate to the printing of books, to testimonies concerning deceased ministers, addresses to the King, if thought necessary, and the like.

vicious customs creeping into the Society, or any new dispositions among its members contrary to their principles? The answers brought by the deputies show it, and advice is contained in the letter adapted to the case. Are the times seasons of difficulty and embarrassment in the commercial world? Is the aspect of the political horizon gloomy, and does it appear big with convulsions? New admonition and advices follow.

A third subject, comprehended in the letter, and which I believe since the year 1787 has frequently formed a standing article in it, is the Slave-Trade. The Quakers consider this trade as so extensively big with misery to their fellow creatures, that their members ought to have a deep and awful feeling, and a religious care and concern, about it. These, and occasionally other subjects, having been duly weighed by the committee, they begin to compose the letter.

When the letter is ready, it is brought into the public meeting, and the whole of it, without interruption, is first read audibly. It is then read over again, and canvassed sentence by sentence. Every sentence, nay every word, is liable to alteration; for any one may make his remarks, and nothing can stand but by the sense of the meeting. When finally settled and approved, it is printed, and dispersed among the members throughout the nation. The letter may be considered as informing the Society of certain matters that occurred in the preceding year, and as conveying to them admonitions on various subjects. This letter is emphatically styled "The General Epistle." The yearly meeting, having now lasted about ten days, is dissolved, after a solemn pause, and the different deputies are at liberty to return home.

This important institution of the yearly meetings brings with it, on every return, its pains and pleasures. To persons of maturer years, who attend at this time on committee after committee, and have various offices to perform, it is certainly an anniversary of care and anxiety, fatigue and trouble. But it affords them, on the other hand, occasions of innocent delight. Some, educated in the same school, and others, united by the ties of blood and youthful friendship, but separated from one another by following in distant situations the various concerns of life, meet together in the intervals of the disciplinary business, and feel, in the warm recognition of their ancient intercourse, a pleasure, which might have been delayed for years but for the intervention of this occasion. To the youth it affords an opportunity, amidst this concourse of members, of seeing those, who are reputed to be of the most exemplary character in the Society, and whom they would not have had the same chance of seeing at any other time. They are introduced, also, at this season

to their relations and family-friends. They visit about, and form new connections in the Society, and are permitted the enjoyment of other reasonable pleasures.

Such is the organization of the discipline or government of the Quakers. Nor may it improperly be called a government, when we consider that, besides all matters relating to the church, it takes cognisance of the actions of Quakers one to another, and of these to their fellow-citizens; and of these, again, to the state; in fact, of all actions of members, if immoral in the eye of the Society, as soon as they are known. It gives out its prohibitions. It marks its crimes. It imposes offices on its subjects. It calls them to disciplinary duties. This government, however, notwithstanding its power, has, as I observed before, no president or head, either permanent or temporary*. There is no first man through the whole Society. Neither has it any badge of office, or mace, or constable's staff, or sword. It may be observed, also, that it has no office of emolument by which its hands can be strengthened, none of its ministers, elders, clerks†, overseers, or deputies, being paid: and yet its administration is firmly conducted, and its laws are better obeyed than laws by persons under any other denomination or government. The constant assemblage of the Quakers at their places of worship, and their unwearied attendance at the monthly and quarterly meetings, which they must often frequent at a great distance, to their own personal inconvenience and to the hindrance of their worldly concerns, must be admitted, in part, as proofs of this last remark. But when we consider them as a distinct people, differing in their manner of speech and in their dress and customs from others, rebelling against fashion and the fashionable world, and likely therefore to become rather the objects of ridicule than of praise; when we consider these things. and their steady and rigid perseverance in the singular rules and customs of the Society, we cannot but regard their obedience to their own discipline, which makes a point of the observance of such distinctions, as extraordinary.

This singular obedience, however, to the laws of the Society may be accouted for on three principles. In the first place, in no society is there so much vigilance over the conduct of its members as in that of the Quakers, as the history of their discipline must have already manifested. This vigilance, of course, cannot miss of its effect. But a second cause is the following;—The Quaker-laws and regulations are not made by any one person, nor by any number even of depu-

* This government or discipline is considered as a theocracy.

† Except the clerk in London, who keeps the general records of the whole Society, and resides on the premises erected for their preservation.

ties. They are made by themselves, that is, by the Society in yearly meeting assembled. If a bad law, or the repeal of a good one, be proposed, every one present, without distinction, has liberty to speak against the motion. The proposition cannot pass against the sense of the meeting. If persons are not present, it is their own fault. Thus it happens that every law passed at the yearly meeting may be considered, in some measure, as the law of every Quaker's own making, or as the law of his own will: and people are much more likely to follow regulations made by their own consent, than those which are made against it. This, therefore, has unquestionably an operation as a second cause. A third may be traced in the peculiar sentiments, which the Quakers hold as a religious body. They believe that maay of their members, when they deliver themselves publicly on any subject at the yearly meeting, are influenced by the dictates of the pure Principle, or by the Spirit of Truth. Hence the laws of the Society, which are the result of such influences, have with them the sanction of spiritual authority. They pay them, therefore, a greater deference on this account than they would to laws, which they conceive to have been the production of the mere imagination or will of man.

CHAPTER V.

Disowning—Foundation of the right of disowning—Disowning no slight punishment—wherein the hardship or suffering consists.

I SHALL conclude the Discipline of the Society by making a few remarks on the subject of Disowning.

The Quakers conceive they have a right to excommunicate or disown, because persons entering into any society have a right to make their own reasonable rules of membership; and so early as in the year 1663 this practice had been adopted by George Fox, and those who were in religious union with him. They, who are born in the Society, are bound of course to abide by these rules while they continue to be the rules of the general will, or to leave it. They, who come into it by convincement are bound to follow them, or not to sue for admission into membership. This right of disowning, which arises from the reasonableness of the thing, the Quakers consider to have been pointed out and established by the Author of the Christian religion, who determined that if a disorderly person,

after having received repeated admonitions, should still continue disorderly, he should be considered as an alien by the church*.

The observations which I shall make on the subject of Disowning, will be wholly confined to it in its operation as a source of suffering to those, who were sentenced to undergo it. People are apt to say, "Where is the hardship of being disowned? A man, though disowned by the Quakers, may still go to their religious meetings; or he may worship, if he choose, with other dissenters, or with those of the church of England; for the doors of all places of worship are open to those who desire to enter them." I shall state, therefore, in what this hardship consists; and I should have done it sooner, but that I could not have made it so well understood, as after an explanation had been given of the discipline of the Quakers, as a distinct subject of my work.

There is no doubt that a person, who is disowned, will be differently affected by different considerations. Something will depend upon the circumstance, whether he considers himself as disowned for a moral or a political offence; something, again, whether he has been in the habit of attending the meetings for discipline, and what estimation he may put upon these.

But whether he had been regular or not in these attendances, it is certain that he has a power and a consequence, while he remains in his own Society, which he looses when he leaves it, or when he goes into the world at large. The reader will have already observed, that in no society is a man, if I may use the expression, so much of a man as in that which is under our consideration, or in no society is there such an equality of rank and privileges. A Quaker is called, as we have seen, to the exercise of important and honorable functions. He sits in his monthly meeting, as it were in council, with the rest of the members. In point of privilege, he sees all equal, but he sees none superior, to himself. He may give his advice on any question. He may propose new matter. He may argue and reply. In the quarterly meeting he is called to the exercise of the same privileges, but on a larger scale. And at the yearly meeting he may, if he please, unite in his own person the offices of counsel, judge, and legislator. But when he leaves the Society, and goes out into the world, he has no such station or power. He sees there everybody equal to himself in privileges, and thousands above him. It is in this loss of his former consequence that he must feel a punishment in having been disowned. For he can never be to his own feelings what he was before. It is almost impossible that he should not feel a diminution of his dignity and importance as a man.

* Matt. xviii., ver. 17.

Neither can he restore himself to these privileges by going to a distant part of the kingdom, and residing among Quakers there, on the supposition that his disownment may be concealed. For every member, going to a new abode among other members, must carry with him a certificate of his conduct from the last monthly meeting which he left, or he cannot be received by these as one of the same flock.

But besides losing these privileges, which confer consequence upon him, he looses others of another kind. He cannot marry in the Society. If a poor man, he is no longer exempt from the militia if drawn, by submitting to three month's imprisonment: nor is he entitled to that comfortable maintenance, in case of necessity, which the Society provide for their own poor.

To these considerations it may not, perhaps, be superfluous to add, that if he continues to mix with the members of his own Society, he will occasionally find circumstances arising which will remind him of his former state: and if he transfers his friendship to others, he will feel awkward and uneasy, and out of his element, till he has made his temper, his opinions, and his manners, harmonize with those of his new associates of the world*.

---

* As Disownment may operate as no slight punishment, the reader ought to recollect, that the offences, for which it may take place, are known beforehand; that pains are taken with the offender; that appeals are allowed him; and that restoration to membership is admissible in the case of repentance. On the other hand, however, it cannot be too seriously insisted upon, that, where religious societies adopt a discipline, they ought to be careful not to swell the number of crimes unnecessarily, but to construe those actions only as such, which the letter and spirit of Christianity strictly warrant, or which Jesus Christ would have pronounced to be offences on the same occasions.

PECULIAR CUSTOMS OF THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.

Dress—Quakers distinguished by their dress from others—Great extravagance in dress in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—this extravagance had reached the clergy—but religious individuals kept to their ancient dresses—The dress which the men of this description wore in those days—dress of the women of this description also—George Fox and the Quakers, springing out of these carried their plain habits with them into their new Society.

I HAVE now explained, in a diffusive manner, the Moral Education and the Discipline of the Quakers. I shall proceed to the explanation of such Customs as seem peculiar to them as a Society of Christians.

The Dress of the Quakers is the first custom of this nature that I purpose to notice.

They stand distinguished by means of it from all other religious bodies. The men do not wear lace, frills, ruffles, swords, or any of the ornaments used by the fashionable world. The women wear no lace, flounces, lappets, rings, bracelets, necklaces, ear-rings, nor any thing belonging to this class. Both sexes are also particular in the choice of the color of their clothes. All gay colors, such as red, blue, green, and yellow, are exploded. Dressing in this manner, a member of this Society is known by his apparel through the whole kingdom. This is not the case with any other individuals of the island, except the clergy; and these, in consequence of the black garments worn by persons on account of the death of their relations, are not always distinguishable from others.

I know of no custom among the Quakers which has more excited the curiosity of others than this of their dress, and none in which they have been more mistaken in their conjectures concerning it.

In the early times of the English history, dress was frequently regulated by the Government*. Persons of a certain rank and fortune were permitted to wear only clothing of a certain kind. But these restrictions and distinctions were gradually broken down; and people, as they were able and willing, launched out into unlimited

* See Strutt's Antiquities.

extravagance in their dress. The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and down from thence to the time when the Quakers first appeared, were periods particularly noticed for prodigality in the use of apparel. There was nothing too expensive or too preposterous to be worn. Our ancestors, also, to use an ancient quotation, "were never constant to one color or fashion two months to an end." We can have no idea, by surveying the present generation, of the folly in such respects of these early ages. But these follies were not confined to the laity. Affectation of parade and gaudy clothing were admitted among many of the clergy, who incurred the severest invectives of the poets on that account. The Ploughman in Chaucer's Canterbury Tales is full upon this point. He gives us the following description of a priest:

"That hye on horse wylleth to ride,
In glytterande gold of great araye,
Ypainted and portred all in pride,
No common knyght may go so gaye;
Chaunge of clothyng every daye,
With golden gyrdels great and small,
As boystrous as is bere at baye:
All suche falshed mote nede fall."

To this he adds, that many of them had more than one or two mitres, embellished with pearls like the head of a queen, and a staff of gold set with jewels, as heavy as lead. He then speaks of their appearing out of doors with broad bucklers and long swords, or with baldrics about their necks, instead of stoles, to which their baselards were attached:

"Bucklers brode and sweardes longe,"—
"Baudryke with baselards kene."

He then accuses them with wearing gay gowns of scarlet and green colors, ornamented with cut-work, and for the long pykes upon their shoes.

But so late as the year 1652 we have the following anecdotes of the whimsical dress of a clergyman:—John Owen, dean of Christ-church, and vice-chancellor of Oxford, is represented as wearing a lawn band, —as having his hair powdered, and his hat curiously cocked. He is described, also, as wearing Spanish-leather boots with lawn-tops, and snake-bone band-strings with large tassels, and a large set of rib-bands pointed at his knees with points or tags at the end. And much about the same time, when Charles the Second was at Newmarket, Nathaniel Vincent, doctor of divinity, fellow of Clare-hall, and chaplain in ordinary to his majesty, preached before him. But

the king was so displeased with the foppery of this preacher's dress, that he commanded the duke of Monmouth, then chancellor of the University, to cause the statutes concerning decency of apparel among the clergy to be put into execution; which was accordingly done.

These instances are sufficient to show that the taste for preposterous and extravagant dress must have operated like a contagion in those times, or the clergy would scarcely have dressed themselves in this ridiculous and censurable manner.

But although this extravagance was found among many orders of society at the time of the appearance of George Fox, yet many individuals had set their faces against the fashions of the world. These consisted principally of religious people of different denominations, most of whom were in the middle classes of life. Such persons were found in plain and simple habits, notwithstanding the contagion of the example of their superiors in rank. The men of this description generally wore plain round hats with common crowns. They had discarded the sugar-loaf hat, and the hat turned up with a silver clasp on one side, as well as all ornaments belonging to it, such as pictures, feathers, and bands of various colors. They had adopted a plain suit of clothes. They wore cloaks, when necessary, over these: but both the clothes and the cloaks were of the same color. The color of each of them was either drab or gray. Other people, who followed the fashions, wore white, red, green, yellow, violet, scarlet, and other colors, which were expensive, because they were principally dyed in foreign parts. The drab consisted of the white wool undyed; and the gray of the white wool mixed with the black, which was undyed also. These colors were then the colors of the clothes, because they were the least expensive, of the peasants of England, as they are now of those of Portugal and Spain. They had discarded, also, all ornaments, such as of lace, or bunches of ribands at the knees; and their buttons were generally of alchymy, as this composition was then termed, or of the same color as their clothes.

The grave and religious women, also, like the men, had avoided the fashions of their times. These had adopted the cap and the black hood for their head-dress. The black hood had been long the distinguishing mark of a grave matron. All prostitutes, so early as Edward the Third, had been forbidden to wear it. In aftertimes it was celebrated by the poets by the epithet of Venerable, and been introduced by painters as the representative of Virtue. When fashionable women had discarded it, which was the case in George Fox's time, the more sober, on account of these ancient marks of its sanctity, had retained it, and it was then common among men. With

respect to the hair of grave and sober women in those days, it was worn plain, and covered occasionally by a plain hat or bonnet. They had avoided by this choice those preposterous head-dresses and bonnets, which none but those, who have seen paintings of them, could believe ever to have been worn. They admitted none of the large ruffs that were then in use, but chose a plain handkerchief for their necks, differing from those of others, which had rich point and curious lace. They rejected the crimson satin doublet with black velvet skirts, and contented themselves with a plain gown, generally of stuff, and of a drab, or gray, or buff, or buffin color as it was called, and faced with buckram. These colors, as I observed before, were the colors worn by country-people, and were not expensive—because they were not dyed. To this gown was added a green apron. Green aprons had been long worn in England; yet, at the time I allude to, they were out of fashion, so as to be ridiculed by the gay: but old-fashioned people still retained them. Thus an idea of gravity was connected with them; and therefore religious and steady women adopted them as the grave and sober garments of ancient times.

It may now be observed, that from these religious persons, habited in this manner in opposition to the fashions of the world, the primitive Quakers generally sprung. George Fox himself wore the plain gray coat that has been noticed, with alchymy buttons, and a plain leathern girdle about his waist. When the Quakers, therefore, first met in religious union, they met in these simple clothes. They made no alteration in their dress on account of their new religion. They prescribed no form or color as distinguishing marks of their sect; but they carried with them the plain habits of their ancestors into their new Society, as the habits of the grave and sober people of their own times.

SECTION II.

But though George Fox introduced no new dress into the Society, he was not indifferent on the subject—he recommended simplicity and plainness—and declaimed against the fashions of the times—supported by Barclay and Penn—these explained the objects of dress—The influence of these explanations—Dress, at length, incorporated into the discipline—but no standard fixed either of shape or color—the objects of dress only recognized, and simplicity recommended—A new era—great variety allowable by the discipline—Quakers have deviated less from the dress of their ancestors than other people.

Though George Fox never introduced any new or particular garments, when he formed the Society, as models worthy of the imitation of those who joined him, yet, as a religious man, he was not indifferent on the subject of dress. Nor could he, as a reformer, see

those extravagant fashions, which I have shown to have existed in his time, without publicly noticing them. We find him accordingly recommending to his followers simplicity and plainness of apparel, and bearing his testimony against the preposterous and fluctuating apparel of the world.

In the various papers, which he wrote or gave forth upon this subject, he laid it down as a position, that all ornaments, superfluities, and unreasonable changes in dress, manifested an earthly or worldly spirit. He laid it down, again, that such things, being adopted principally for the lust of the eye, were productive of vanity and pride; and that, in proportion as men paid attention to these outward decorations and changes, they suffered some loss in the value and dignity of their minds. He considered, also, all such decorations and changes as contrary both to the letter and the spirit of the Scriptures. Isaiah, one of the greatest prophets under the Law, had severely reproved the daughters of Israel on account of their tinkling ornaments, cauls, round tires, chains, bracelets, rings, and ear-rings. St. Paul, also, and St. Peter, had both of them cautioned the women of their own times to adorn themselves in modest apparel, and not with broidered hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array. And the former had spoken to both sexes indiscriminately not to conform to the world; in which latter expression he evidently included all those customs of the world, of whatsoever nature, that were in any manner injurious to the morality of the minds of those, who followed them.

By the publication of these sentiments George Fox showed to the world, that it was his opinion that religion, though it prescribed no particular form of apparel, was not indifferent as to the general subject of dress. These sentiments became the sentiments of his followers: but the Society was coming fast into a new situation. When the members of it first met in union, they consisted of grown-up persons; of such as had had their minds spiritually exercised, and their judgments convinced in religious matters; of such, in fact, as had been Quakers in spirit before they had become Quakers by name. All admonitions, therefore, on the subject of dress were unnecessary for such persons. But many of those, who had joined the Society, brought with them children into it, and, from the marriages of others, children were daily springing up. To the latter, in a profligate age, where the fashions were still raging from without, and making an inroad upon the minds and morals of individuals, some cautions were necessary for the preservation of their innocence in such a storm. For these were the reverse of their parents. Young in point of age, they were Quakers by name before they could become Quakers in spirit. Robert Barclay, therefore, and William Penn, kept alive the

subject of dress, which George Fox had been the first to notice in the Society. They followed him on his scriptural ground. They repeated the arguments, that extravagant dress manifested an earthly spirit, and that it was productive of vanity and pride. But they strengthened the case by adding arguments of their own. Among these I may notice, that they considered what were the objects of dress. They reduced these to two,—to decency and comfort,—in which latter idea was included protection from the varied inclemencies of the weather. Every thing, therefore, beyond these they considered as superfluous: of course, all ornaments would become censurable, and all unreasonable changes indefensible, upon such a system.

These discussions, however, on this subject never occasioned the more ancient members to make any alteration in their dress; for they continued, as when they had come into the Society, to be a plain people. But they occasioned parents to be more vigilant over their children in this respect, and they taught the Society to look upon dress as a subject connected with the Christian religion, in any case where it could become injurious to the morality of the mind. In process of time, therefore, as the fashions continued to spread, and as the youth of the Society began to come under their dominion, the Quakers incorporated dress among the other subjects of their discipline. Hence, no member, after this period, could dress himself preposterously, or follow the fleeting fashions of the world, without coming under the authority of friendly and wholesome admonition. Hence, an annual inquiry began to be made, if parents brought up their children to dress consistently with their Christian profession. The Society, however, recommended only simplicity and plainness to be attended to on this occasion. They prescribed no standard, no form, no color, for the apparel of their members. They acknowledged the two great objects of decency and comfort, and left their members to clothe themselves consistently with these, as it was agreeable to their convenience or their disposition.

A new era commenced from this period. Persons already in the Society continued of course in their ancient dresses. If others had come into it by convincement, who had led gay lives, they laid aside their gaudy garments, and took those that were more plain: and the children of both, from this time, began to be habited from their youth as their parents were.

But though Quakers had thus brought apparel under the disciplinary cognisance of the Society, yet the dress of individuals was not always alike, nor did it continue always one and the same even with the primitive members of it; nor has it continued one and the

same with their descendants. For, decency and comfort having been declared to be the true and only objects of dress, such a latitude was given as to admit of great variety in apparel. Hence, if we were to see a group of modern Quakers before us, we should probably not find any two of them dressed alike. Health, we all know, may require alterations in dress. Simplicity may suggest others. Convenience, again, may point out others: and yet all these various alterations may be consistent with the objects before specified. And here it may be observed that the Society, during its existence for a century and a half, has without doubt, in some degree, imperceptibly followed the world, though not in its fashions, yet in its improvements of clothing.

It must be obvious, again, that some people are of a grave and that others are of a lively disposition, and that these will probably never dress alike. Other members, again, but particularly the rich, have a larger intercourse than the rest of them, or mix more, with the world. These, again, will probably dress a little differently from others; and yet, regarding the two great objects of dress, their clothing may come within the limits which these allow. Indeed, if there be any, whose apparel would be thought exceptionable by the Society, these would be found among the rich. Money, in all societies, generally takes the liberty of introducing exceptions. Nothing, however, is more true than that even among the richest of the Society there is frequently as much plainness and simplicity in their outward dress as among the poor: and, where the exceptions exist, they are seldom carried to an extravagant, and never to a preposterous, extent.

From this account it will be seen, that the ideas of the world are erroneous on the subject of the dress of the Quakers; for it has always been imagined that, when the early Quakers first met in religious union, they met to deliberate and fix upon some standard, which should operate as a political institution, by which the members should be distinguished by their apparel from the rest of the world. The whole history, however, of the shape and color of the garments of the Society is as has been related, namely, that the primitive members dressed like the sober, steady, and religious people of the age in which the Society sprung up, and that their descendants have departed less, in a course of time, than others from the dress of their ancestors. The men's hats are nearly the same now, except that they have stays and loops, and many of their clothes are nearly of the same shape and color, as in the days of George Fox. The dress of the women, also, is nearly similar. The black hoods indeed have gone, in a certain degree, out of use: but

many of such women as are ministers and elders, and indeed many others of age and gravity of manners, still retain them. The green apron, also, has been nearly, if not wholly laid aside. There was here and there an ancient woman who used it within the last ten years; but I am told that the last of these died lately. No other reasons can be given, than those which have been assigned, why Quaker-women should have been found in the use of a color, that is so unlike any other, which they now use in their dress. Upon the whole, if the females were still to retain the use of the black hood and the green apron, and the men were to discard the stays and loops for their hats, we should find that persons of both sexes in the Society, but particularly such as are antiquated, or as may be deemed old-fashioned in it, would approach very near to the first or primitive members in their appearance, both as to the sort, and to the shape, and to the color, of their clothes. Thus has George Fox, by means of the advice he gave upon this subject, and the general discipline which he introduced into the Society, kept up, for a hundred and fifty years, against the powerful attacks of the varying fashions ions of the world, one steady and uniform external appearance among his descendants; an event, which neither the clergy by means of their sermons, nor other writers, whether grave or gay, were able to accomplish during the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries, and which none of their successors have been able to accomplish from that time to the present.

SECTION III.

The world usually make objections to the Quaker-dress—the charge is, that there is a preciseness in it, which is equivalent to the worshiping of forms—The truth of this charge not to be ascertained but by a knowledge of the heart—But outward facts make against it—such as the origin of the Quaker-dress—and the Quaker-doctrine on dress—Doctrine of Christianity on this subject—opinion of the early Christians upon it—reputed advantages of the Quaker-dress.

I should have been glad to have dismissed the subject of the Quaker-dress in the last section; but so many objections are usually made against it, that I thought it right to stop for awhile in the present place. Indeed, if I were to choose a subject, upon which the world had been more than ordinarily severe on the members of this Society, I should select that of their dress. Almost every body has something to say upon this point: and in almost all cases, where arguments are numerous, many of them are generally frivulous, so it has happened in this also. There is one, however, which it is impossible not to notice upon this subject.

The Quakers, it is confessed by their adversaries, are not chargeable with the same sort of pride and vanity, which attach to the characters of other people, who dress in a gay manner, and who follow the fashions of the world; but it is contended, on the other hand, that they are justly chargeable with a preciseness, that is disgusting, in the little particularities of their clothing. This precise attention to particularities is considered as little better than the worship of lifeless forms, and is usually called by the world the Idolatry of the Quaker-dress.

This charge, if it were true, would be serious indeed. It would be serious, because it would take away from the religion of the Society one of its greatest and best characters. For how could any people be spiritually-minded, who were the worshipers of lifeless forms? It would be serious, again, because it would show their religion, like the box of Pandora, to be, pregnant with evils within itself. For people, who place religion in particular forms, must unavoidably become superstitious. It would be serious, again, because, if parents were to carry such notions into their families, they would produce mischief. The young would be dissatisfied, if forced to cultivate particularities, for which they see no just or substantial reason. Dissentions would arise amongst them. Their morality, too, would be confounded, if they were to see these minutiæ idolized at home, but disregarded by persons of known religious character in the world. Add to which, they might adopt erroneous notions of religion; for they might be induced to lay too much stress upon the payment of the anise and cummin, and too little upon the observance of the weightier matters of the law.

As the charge, therefore, is unquestionably a serious one, I shall not allow it to pass without some comments. And in the first place it may be observed, that whether this preciseness, which has been imputed to some Quakers, amounts to an idolizing of forms, can never be positively determined, unless we had the power of looking into the hearts of those, who have incurred the charge. We may form, however, a reasonable conjecture whether it does not, by presumptive evidence, taken from incontrovertible outward facts.

The first outward fact, that presents itself to us, is the fact of the origin of the Quaker-dress. If the primitive members, when they met in religious union, had met to deliberate and fix upon a form or standard of apparel for the Society, in vain could any person have expected to repel this charge. But no such standard was ever fixed. The dress of the Society has descended from father to son, in the way that has been described. There is reason, therefore, to suppose that the Quakers, as a religious body, have deviated less than others

from the primitive habits of their ancestors, rather from a fear of the effects of unreasonable changes of dress upon the mind, than from an attachment to lifeless forms.

The second outward fact, which may be resorted to as furnishing a ground for reasonable conjecture, is the doctrine of the Quakers on this subject. They profess to follow Christianity in all cases, where its doctrines can be clearly ascertained. I shall state, therefore, what Christianity says upon this point. I shall show that what Quakerism says is in unison with it; and I shall explain more at large the principle, that has given birth to the discipline of the Quakers relative to their dress.

Had Christianity approved of the make or color of any particular garment, it would have approved of those of its Founder and of his Apostles. We do not, however, know what any any of these illustrious personages wore. They were, probably, dressed in the habits of Judæan peasants, and not with any marked difference from those of the same rank in life: and that they were dressed plainly, we have every reason to believe from the censures, which some of them passed on the superfluities of apparel. But Christianity has nowhere recorded these habits as a pattern, nor has it prescribed to any man a form or color for his clothes.

But Christianity, though it nowhere places religion in particular forms, is yet not indifferent on the general subject of dress. For, in the first place, it discards all ornaments, as appears by the testimonies of St. Paul and St. Peter before quoted; and this it does evidently on the ground of morality,—lest these, by puffing up the creature, should be made to give birth to the censurable passions of vanity and lust. In the second place, it forbids all unreasonable changes on the plea of conformity with the fashions of the world: and it sets its face against these, also, upon moral grounds; because the following of the fashions of the world begets a worldly spirit; and because, in proportion as men indulge this spirit, they are found to follow the loose and changeable morality of the world, instead of the strict and steady morality of the Gospel.

That the early Christians understood these to be the doctrines of Christianity on this subject, there can be no doubt. The Presbyters, and the Ascetics, I believe, changed the Pallium for the Toga in the infancy of the Christian world; but all other Christians were left undistinguished by their dress. These were generally clad in the sober manner of their own times. They observed a medium between costliness and sordidness. That they had no particular form for their dress beyond that of other grave people, we learn from Justin Martyr:—"They affected nothing fantastic," says he, "but,

living among Greeks and Barbarians, they followed the customs of the country; and in clothes, and in diet, and in all other affairs of outward life, they showed the excellent and admirable constitution of their discipline and conversation." That they discarded superfluities and ornaments, we may collect from various authors of those times. Basil reduced the objects of clothing to two, namely, honesty and necessity, that is, to decency and protection. Tertullian laid it down as a doctrine, that a Christian should not only be chaste, but that he should appear so outwardly. "The garments, which we should wear," says Clemens of Alexandria, "should be modest and frugal, and not wrought of divers colors, but plain." Chrysostom commends Olympias, a lady of birth and fortune, for having in her dress nothing that was wrought or gaudy. Jerome praises Paula, another lady of quality, for the same reason. We find, also, that an unreasonable change of clothing, or a change to please the eye of the world, was held improper. Cyril says, "We should not strive for variety, having clothes for home, and others for ostentation abroad." In short, the ancient fathers frequently complained of the abuse of apparel in the ways described.

Exactly in the same manner, and in no other, have the Quakers considered the doctrine of Christianity on the subject of dress. They have never adopted any particular model, either in form or color, for their clothes. They have regarded the two objects of decency and comfort; but they have allowed of various deviations consistently with these. They have, in fact, fluctuated in their dress. The English Quaker wore formerly a round hat: he wears it now with stays and loops. But even this fashion is not universal, and seems rather now on the decline. The American Quaker, on the other hand, has generally kept to the round hat. Black hoods, were uniformly worn by the women of this Society; but the use of these is much less than it was, and is still decreasing. Green aprons, also, were worn by the females, but they are now wholly out of use. These changes could not, however, have taken place, had there been any fixed standard for the Quaker-dress.

But though the Quakers have no particular model for their clothing, yet they are not indifferent to dress, where it may be morally injurious. They have discarded all superfluities and ornaments, because they may be hurtful to the mind. They have set their faces, also, against all unreasonable changes of forms, for the same reason. They have allowed other reasons also to weigh with them in the latter case. They have received from their ancestors a plain suit of apparel, which has in some little degree followed the improvements of the world, and they see no good reason why they

should change it; at least, they see in the fashions of the world none but a censurable reason for a change. And here it may be observed, that it is not an attachment to forms, but an unreasonable change and deviation from them, that the Quakers regard. Upon the latter idea it is that their discipline is in a great measure founded; or, in other words, the Quakers, as a religious body, think it right to watch in their youth any unreasonable deviation from the plain apparel of the Society.

This they do, first, because any change beyond usefulness must be made upon the plea of conformity to the fashions of the world.

Secondly, because any such deviation in their youth is considered to show, in some measure, a deviation from simplicity of heart. It bespeaks the beginning of an unstable mind. It shows there must have been some improper motive for the change. Hence it argues a weakness in the deviating persons, and points them out as objects to be strengthened by wholesome admonition.

Thirdly, because these changes, made without reasonable motives, would lead, if not watched and checked, to other still greater changes; and because an uninterrupted succession of such changes would bring the minds of their youth under the most imperious of all despotisms,—the despotism of fashion;—in consequence of which they would cleave to the morality of the world instead of the morality of the Gospel.

And fourthly, because, in proportion as young persons deviate from the plainness and simplicity of the apparel as worn by the Society, they approach in appearance to the world, they mix with it, they imbibe its spirit, and admit its customs, and come into a situation which subjects them to be disowned; and this is so generally true, that of those persons, whom the Society has been obliged to disown, the commencement of a long progress in irregularity may often be traced to a deviation from the simplicity of their dress. And here it may be observed, that an effect has been produced by this care concerning dress, so beneficial to the moral interests of the Society, that they have found in it a new reason for new vigilance on this subject. The effect produced is a general similarity of outward appearance in all the members, though there is a difference both in the form and color of their clothing: and this general appearance is such, as to make them still known to the world. The dress, therefore, of the Quakers, by distinguishing the members of the Society, and making them known as such to the world, makes the world overseers, as it were, of their moral conduct. And that it operates in this way, or that it becomes a partial check in favor of morality, there can be no question. For a Quaker could not be seen either at

public races, or at cock-fightings, or at assemblies, or in public houses, but the fact would be noticed as singular, and probably soon known among his friends. His clothes would betray him. Neither could he, if at a great distance from home, and if quite out of the eye and observation of persons of the same religious persuasion, do what many others do. For the Quaker knows that many of the customs of the Society are known to the world at large, and that a certain conduct is expected from a person in his habit. The fear, therefore, of being detected, and at any rate of bringing infamy on his cloth, if I may use the expression, would operate so as to keep him out of many of the vicious customs of the world.

From hence it will be obvious, that there cannot be any solid foundation for the charge which has been made against the Quakers on the subject of dress. They are found in their present dress, not on the principle of an attachment to any particular form, or because any one form is more sacred than another, but on the principle that an unreasonable deviation from any simple and useful clothing is both censurable and hurtful, if made in conformity with the fashions of the world. These two principles, though they may produce, if acted upon, a similar outward appearance in persons, are yet widely distinct, as to their foundation, from one another. The former is the principle of idolatry. The latter is that of religion. If, therefore, there be persons in the Society, who adopt the former, they will come within the reach of the charge described: but the latter only can be adopted by true Quakers.

CHAPTER II.

Quakers are in the use of plain furniture—this usage founded on principles similar to those on dress—this usage general—Quakers have seldom paintings, prints, or portraits, in their houses, as articles of furniture—reasons for their disuse of such articles.

As the members of this Society are found in the use of garments differing from those of others in their shape and fashion, and in the graveness of their color, and in the general plainness of their appearance, so they are found in the use of plain and frugal furniture in their houses.

The custom of using plain furniture has not arisen from the circumstance, that any particular persons in the Society, estimable for their lives and characters, have set the example in their own fami-

lies, but from the principles of the Quaker-constitution itself. It has arisen from principles similar to those, which dictated the continuance of the ancient Quaker-dress. The choice of furniture, like the choice of clothes, is left to be adjudged by the rules of decency and usefulness, but never by the suggestions of show. The adoption of taste instead of utility, in this case, would be considered as a conscious conformity with the fashions of the world. Splendid furniture, also, would be considered as pernicious as splendid clothes. It would be classed with external ornaments, and would be reckoned equally productive of pride with these. The custom, therefore, of plainness in the articles of domestic use is pressed upon all members: and that the subject may not be forgotten, it is incorporated into their religious discipline; in consequence of which it is held forth to their notice, in a public manner, in all the monthly and quarterly meetings of the kingdom, and in all the preparative meetings at least once in a year.

It may be admitted as a truth, that the Society practices, with few exceptions, what is considered to be the proper usage on such occasions. The poor, we know, cannot use any but homely furniture. The middle classes are universally in such habits. As to the rich, there is a difference in the practice of these. Some, and indeed many of them, use as plain and frugal furniture as those in moderate circumstances. Others, again, step beyond the practice of the middle classes, and buy what is more costly, not with a view of show, so much as to accommodate their furniture to the size and goodness of their houses. In the houses of others, again, who have more than ordinary intercourse with the world, we now and then see what is elegant, but seldom what would be considered to be extravagant furniture. We see no chairs with satin bottoms and gilded frames, no magnificent pier-glasses, no superb chandeliers, no curtains with extravagant trimmings: at least, in all my intercourse with the Quakers I have never observed such things. If there are persons in the Society who use them, they must be few in number; and these must be conscious that, by the introduction of such finery* into their houses, they are going against the advices annually given them in their meetings on this subject, and that they are therefore violating the written law, as well as departing from the spirit of Quakerism.

But if these or similar principles are adopted by the Society on this subject, it must be obvious, that in walking through the rooms of the Quakers we shall look in vain for some articles, that are

* Turkey carpets are in use, though generally gaudy, on account of their wearing better than others.

classed among the furniture of other people. We shall often be disappointed, for instance, if we expect to find either paintings or prints in frames. I seldom remember to have seen above three or four articles of this description in all my intercourse with the Quakers. Some families had one of these, others a second, and others a third, but none had them all: and in many families neither the one nor the other was to be seen.

One of the prints, to which I allude, contained a representation of the conclusion of the famous Treaty between William Penn and the Indians of America. This transaction, every body knows, afforded, in all its circumstances, a proof to the world of the singular honor and uprightness of those members of the Society, who were concerned in it. The Indians, too, entertained an opinion no less favorable of their character; for they handed down the memory of the event under such impressive* circumstances, that their descendants have a particular love for the character, and a particular reliance on the word, of a Quaker at the present day. The print alluded to was therefore probably hung up as the pleasing record of a transaction so highly honorable to the principles of the Society; where Knowledge took no advantage of Ignorance, but where she associated herself with Justice, that she might preserve the balance equal. "This is the only treaty," says a celebrated writer, "between the Indians and the Christians, that was never ratified by an oath, and was never broken."

The second was the print of a Slave-ship, published a few years ago, when the circumstances of the Slave-trade became a subject of national inquiry. In this the oppressed Africans are represented as stowed in different parts, according to the number transported and to the scale of the dimensions of the vessel. This subject could not be indifferent to those, who had exerted themselves as a body for the annihilation of this inhuman traffic. The print, however, was not hung up by the Quakers either as a monument of what they had done themselves, or as a stimulus to further exertion on the same subject, but, I believe, from the pure motive of exciting benevolence; —of exciting the attention of those, who should come into their houses, to the case of the injured African, and of procuring sympathy in their favor.

The third contained a Plan of the building of Ackworth School. This was hung up as a descriptive view of a public seminary, instituted and kept up by the subscription and care of the Society at large.

---

* The Indians denominated Penn, Brother Onas, which means in their language a pen, and respect the Quakers as his descendants.

But though all the prints that have been mentioned, were hung up in frames on the motives severally assigned to them, no others were to be seen as their companions. It is, in short, not the practice* of the Society to decorate their houses in this manner. Prints in frames, if hung up promiscuously in a room, would be considered as ornamental furniture, or as furniture for show. They would therefore come under the denomination of superfluities; and the admission of such, in the way that other people admit them, would be considered as an adoption of the empty customs or fashions of the world.

But though the members of this Society are not in the practice of hanging up prints in frames, yet there are amateurs among them, who have a number and variety of prints in their possession. But these appear chiefly in collections, bound together in books, or preserved in port-folios, and not in frames as ornamental furniture for their rooms. These amateurs, however, are but few in number. The Quakers have in general only a plain and useful education. They are not brought up to admire such things; and they have, therefore, in general but little taste for the fine and masterly productions of the painter's art.

Neither would a person in going through the houses of the Quakers find any portraits either of themselves, or of any of their families, or ancestors, except, in the latter case, they had been taken before they became Quakers. The first Quakers never had their portraits taken with their own knowledge or consent. Considering themselves as poor and helpless creatures, and as little better than dust and ashes, they had but a mean idea of their own images. They were of opinion, also, that pride and self-conceit would be likely to arise to men from the view and ostentatious parade of their own persons. They considered also, that it became them, as the founders of the Society, to bear their testimony against the vain and superfluous fashions of the world. They believed, also, if there were those whom they loved, that the best method of showing their regard to these would be, not by having their fleshly images before their eyes, but by preserving their best actions in their thoughts, as worthy of imitation; and that their own memory, in the same manner, should be perpetuated rather in the loving hearts, and kept alive in the edifying conversation, of their descendants, than in the perishing tablets of canvass fixed upon the walls of their habitations.

---

* There are still individual exceptions. Some Quakers have come accidentally into possession of paintings and engravings in frame, which, being innocent in their subject and their lesson they have thought proper to retain.

Hence, no portraits are to be seen of many of those great and eminent men in the Society, who are now mingled with the dust.

These ideas, which thus actuated the first Quakers on this subject, are those of their descendants, as a body, at the present day. There may be here and there an individual who has had a portrait of some of his family taken: but such instances may be considered as rare exceptions from the general rule. In no society is it possible to establish maxims, which shall influence an universal practice.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

Language—Quakers differ in their language from others—the first alteration made by George Fox of Thou for You—this change has been suggested by Erasmus and Luther—Sufferings of the Quakers in consequence of adopting this change—a work published in their defence—this presented to King Charles and others—Other works on the subject of Barclay and Penn—in these the word Thou shown to be proper in all languages—You, to be a mark of flattery—the latter idea corroborated by Howell, Maresius, Godeau, Erasmus.

As the Quakers are distinguishable from their fellow-citizens by their dress, as was amply shown in a former chapter, so they are not less distinguishable from them by the peculiarities of their language.

George Fox seemed to look at every custom with the eye of a reformer. The language of the country, as used in his own time, struck him as having many censurable defects. Several of the expressions then in use appeared to him to contain gross flattery, others to be idolatrous, others to be false representatives of the ideas they were intended to convey. Now, he considered that Christianity required truth; and he believed therefore that he and his followers, who professed to be Christians in word and deed, and to follow the Christian pattern in all things, as far as it could be found, were called upon to depart from all the censurable modes of speech, as much as they were from any of the customs of the world, which Christianity had deemed objectionable. And so weightily did these improprieties in his own language lie upon his mind, that he conceived himself to have had an especial commission to correct them.

The first alteration, which he adopted, was in the use of the pronoun Thou. The pronoun You, which grammarians had fixed to be of the plural number, was then occasionally used, but less than it is

now, in addressing an individual. George Fox, therefore, adopted Thou in its place on this occasion, leaving the word You to be used only where two or more individuals were addressed.

George Fox, however, was not the first of the religions writers, who had noticed the improper use of the pronoun You. Erasmus employed a treatise in showing the propriety of thou, when addressed to a single person; and in ridiculing the use of You, on the same occasion. Martin Luther also took great pains to expunge the word You from the station which it occupied, and to put Thou in its place. In his Ludus he ridicules the use of the former by the following invented sentence:—"Magister, Vos estis iratus?"—This is as absurd as if he had said in English,—"Gentlemen, art Thou angry?"

But though George Fox was not the first to recommend the substitution of Thou for You, he was the first to reduce this amended use of it to practice. This he did in his own person wherever he went. and in all the works which he published. All his followers did the same. And from his time to the present, the pronoun Thou has come down so prominent in the speech of the Society, that its members are generally known by it at the present day.

The reader would hardly believe, if historical facts did not prove it, how much noise the introduction, or rather the amended use, of this little particle, as reduced to practice by George Fox, made in the world; and how much ill usage it occasioned the early Quakers. Many magistrates, before whom they were carried in the early times of their institution, occasioned their sufferings to be greater merely on this account. They were often abused and beaten by others, and sometimes put in danger of their lives. It was a common question put to a Quaker in those days, who addressed a great man in this new and simple manner, "Why, you ill-bred clown, do you Thou me?" The rich and mighty of these times thought themselves degraded by this mode of address, as reducing them from a plural magnitude to a singular, or individual, or simple, station in life. "The use of Thou," says George Fox, "was a sore cut to proud flesh, and those who sought self-honor."

George Fox, finding that both he and his followers were thus subject to much persecution on this account, thought it right the world should know, that, in using this little particle, which had given so much offence, the Society was only doing what every grammarian ought to do, if he followed his own rules. Accordingly. a Quaker-work was produced, which was written to show, that in all languages Thou was the proper and usual form of speech to a single person, and You to more than one. This was exemplified by instances taken out of the Scriptures, and out of books of teach-

ing in about thirty languages. Two members, of the names of John Stubbs and Benjamin Furly, took great pains in compiling it: and some additions were made to it by George Fox himself, who was then a prisoner in Lancaster castle.

This work, as soon as it was published, was presented to King Charles the Second, and to his council. Copies of it were also sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of London, and to each of the Universities. The king delivered his sentiments upon it so far as to say, that Thou was undoubtedly the proper language of all nations. The archbishop of Canterbury, when he was asked what he thought of it, is described to have been so much at a stand that he could not tell what to say. The book was afterwards bought by many. It is said to have spread conviction wherever it went. Hence it had the effect of lessening the prejudices of some; so that the Quakers were never afterwards treated, on this account, in the same rugged manner as they had been before.

But though this book procured the members of the Society an amelioration of treatment on the amended use of the expression Thou, there were individuals in it, who thought they ought to put their defence on a better foundation, by stating all the reasons (for there were many besides those in this book) which had induced them to differ from their fellow-citizens on this subject. This was done both by Robert Barclay and William Penn in works, which defended other principles of the Quakers, and other peculiarities in their language.

One of the arguments, on which the use of the pronoun Thou was defended, was the same as that, on which it had been defended by Stubbs and Furly,—that is, its strict conformity with grammar. The translators of the Bible had invariably used it. The Liturgy had been compiled on the same principle. All addresses made by English Christians in their private prayers to the Supreme Being were made in the language of Thou, and not of You. And this was done, because the rules of the English grammar warranted the expression, and because any other mode of expression would have been a violation of those rules.

But the great argument, to omit all others, which Penn and Barclay insisted upon for the change of You, was that the pronoun Thou, in addressing an individual, had been anciently in use, but that it had been deserted for You, for no other purpose than that of flattery to men; and that this dereliction of it was growing greater and greater, upon the same principle, in their own times. Hence, as Christians, who were not to puff up the fleshly creature, it became them to return to the ancient and grammatical use of the pronoun

Thou, and to reject this growing fashion of the world. "The word You," says William Penn, "was first ascribed, in way of flattery, to proud popes and emperors, imitating the Heathen's vain homage to their gods, thereby ascribing a plural honor to a single person; as if one pope had been made up of many gods, and one emperor of many men; for which reason You, only to be addressed to many, became first spoken to one. It seemed the word Thou looked like too lean and thin a respect: and therefore some, bigger than they should be, would have a style suitable to their own ambition."

It will be difficult for those, who now use the word You constantly to a single person, and who in such use of it never attach any idea of flattery to it, to conceive how it ever could have had the origin ascribed to it; or, what is more extraordinary, how men could believe themselves to be exalted, when others applied to them the word You instead of Thou. But history affords abundant evidence of the fact.

It is well known that Caligula ordered himself to be worshipped as a god. Domitian, after him, gave similar orders in respect to himself. In process of time the very statues of the emperors began to be worshipped. One blasphemous innovation prepared the way for another. The title of Pontifex Maximus gave way at length for those of Eternity, Divinity, and the like. Coeval with these appellations was the change of the word Thou for You, and upon the same principles. These changes, however, were not so disagreeable, as they might be expected to have been, to the proud Romans; for, while they gratified the pride of their emperors, they made their despotism in their own conceit more tolerable to themselves. That one man should be lord over many thousand Romans, who were the masters of the world, was in itself a degrading thought. But they consoled themselves by the haughty consideration, that they were yielding obedience not to a man, but to an incarnate dæmon, or good genius, or especial envoy from Heaven. They considered, also, the emperor as an office, and as an office including and representing many other offices; and hence, considering him as a man in the plural number, they had less objection to address him in a plural manner.

The Quakers, in behalf of their assertions on this subject, quote the opinions of several learned men, and of those in particular, who, from the nature of their respective writings, had occasion to look into the origin and construction of the words and forms of language.

Howell, in his Epistle to the Nobility of England, placed before his French and English Dictionary, takes notice that both in France and in other nations the word Thou was used in speaking to one:

but, by succession of time, when the Roman commonwealth grew into an empire, the courtiers began to magnify the emperor, as being furnished with power to confer dignities and offices, using the word You; yea, and deifying him with more remarkable titles; concerning which matter we read in the Epistles of Symmachus to the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, where he useth these forms of speaking: "Vestra Eternitas, Vestrum Numen, Vestra Serenitas, Vestra Clementia;" that is, Your, and not Thy, Eternity, Godhead, Serenity, Clemency. So that the word You in the plural number, together with the other titles and compellations of honor, seem to have had their rise from despotic government, which afterwards, by degrees, came to be derived to private persons. He says, also, in his History of France, that in ancient times the peasants addressed their kings by the appellation of Thou; but that pride and flattery first put inferiors upon paying a plural respect to the single person of every superior, and superiors upon receiving it.

John Maresius, of the French Academy, in the Preface to his Clovis, speaks much to the same effect:—"Let none wonder," says he, "that the word Thou is used in this work to princes and princesses, for we use the same to God. And of old the same was used to Alexanders, Cæsars, queens and empresses. The use of the word You, when only one person is spoken to, was only introduced by these base flatteries of men of later ages, to whom it seemed good to use the plural number to one person, that he may imagine himself alone to be equal to many others in dignity and worth; from whence it came at last to persons of lower quality."

Godeau, in his Preface to the Translation of the New Testament, makes an apology for differing from the customs of the times in the use of Thou, and intimates that You was substituted for it, as a word of superior respect. "I had rather," says he, "faithfully keep to the express words of Paul, than exactly follow the polished style of our tongue. Therefore I always use that form of calling God in the singular number, and not in the plural, and therefore I say rather Thou than You. I confess, indeed, that the civility and custom of this world require him to be honored after that manner. But it is likewise, on the contrary, true, that the original tongue of the New Testament hath nothing common with such manners and civility; so that not one of these many old versions that we have doth observe it. Let not men believe that we give not respect enough to God, in that we call him by the word Thou; which is nevertheless far otherwise. For I seem to myself (may be by the effect of custom) more to honor his Divine Majesty in calling him after this manner, than if I should call him after the manner of men, who are so delicate in their forms of speech."

Erasmus, also, in the Treatise, which he wrote on the Impropriety of substituting You for Thou, when a person addresses an individual, states that this strange substitution originated wholly in the flattery of men.

SECTION II.

Other alterations in the language of the Quakers—they addressed one another by the title of Friends—and others by the title of Friends or Neighbors, or by their common names—The use of Sir and Madam abolished—also, of Master, or Mister, and of Humble Servant—also, of titles of honor—Reasons of this abolition—Example of Jesus Christ.

Another alteration, that took place in the language of the Society, was the expunging of all expressions from the vocabulary, which were either superfluous, or of the same flattering tendency as the former.

In addressing one another, either personally or by letter, they made use of the word Friend, to signify the bond of their own union, and the character which man, under the Christian dispensation, was bound to exhibit in his dealings with his fellow-man. They addressed each other, also, and spoke of each other, by their real names. If a man's name was John, they called him John; they talked to him as John; and added only his surname to distinguish him from others.

In their intercourse with the world, they adopted the same mode of speech; for they addressed individuals either by their plain names, or they made use of the appellation of Friends and Neighbors.

They rejected the words Sir or Madam, as then in use. This they did, because they considered them, like the word You, as remnants of ancient flattery, derived from the papal and antichristian ages; and because these words still continued to be considered as titles of flattery, that puffed up people in their own times. Howell, who was before quoted on the pronoun Thou, is usually quoted by the Quakers on this occasion also. He states in his History, that "Sir and Madam were originally names given to none but the king, his brother, and their wives, both in France and England: Yet now the ploughman in France is called Sir, and his wife Madam; and men of ordinary trades in England Sir, and their wives Dame; which is the legal title of a lady, and is the same as Madam in French. So prevalent have pride and flattery been in all ages, the one to give and the other to receive respect!"

The Quakers banished also the word Master, or Mister as it is now pronounced, from their language, either when they spoke concerning any one, or addressed any one by letter. To have used the word

Master to a person, who was no master over them, would have been to have indicated a needless servility, and to have given a false picture of their own situation, as well as of those addressed.

Upon the same or similar principles they hesitated to subscribe themselves as the humble or obedient Servants of any one, as is now usual, at the bottom of their letters. "Horrid apostacy!" says Barclay; "for it is notorious that the use of these compliments implies not any design of service." This expression in particular they reprobated for another reason: it was one of those, which had followed the last deluge of impious services and expressions, which had poured in after the statues of the emperors had been worshipped, after the titles of Eternity and Divinity had been ushered in, and after Thou had been exchanged for You; and it had taken a certain station, and flourished among these. Good Christians, however, had endeavored to keep themselves clear of such inconsistencies. Casaubon has preserved a letter of Paulinus*, bishop of Nola, in which he rebukes Sulpicius Severus for having subscribed himself "his humble Servant." A part of the letter runs thus;—"Take heed hereafter, how thou, being from a servant called unto liberty, dost subscribe thyself Servant to one, who is thy brother and fellow-servant: for it is a sinful flattery, not a testimony of humility, to pay those honors to a man and to a sinner, which are due to the one Lord, one Master, and one God."

The Quakers also banished from the use of their Society all those modes of expression, which were considered as marks or designations of honor among men. Hence, in addressing any peer of the realm, they never used the common formula of "My Lord;" for though the peer in question might justly be the lord over many possessions, and tenants, and servants, yet he was no lord over their heritages or persons. Neither did they ever use the terms Excellency, or Grace, or Honor, upon similar occasions. They considered that the bestowing of these titles might bring them under the necessity of uttering what might be occasionally false. "For, the persons," says Barclay, "obtaining these titles, either by election or hereditarily, may frequently be found to have nothing really in them deserving them, or answering to them; as some, to whom it is said

* Paulinus flourished in the year 460. He is reported by Paulus Diaconus to have been an exemplary Christian. Among other acts, he is stated to have expended all his revenues in the redemption of Christian captives; and at last, when he had nothing left in his purse, to have pawned his own person in favor of a widow's son. The barbarians, says the same author, struck with this act of unparalleled devotion to the cause of the unfortunate, released him, and many prisoners with him, without ransom.

'Your Excellency,' may have nothing of excellency in them; and he, who is called Your Grace, may be an enemy to grace; and he, who is called Your Honor, may be base and ignoble." They considered, also, that they might be setting up the creature, by giving him the titles of the Creator, so that he might think more highly of himself than he ought, and more degradingly than he ought of the rest of the human race.

But independently of these moral considerations, they rejected these titles, because they believed that Jesus Christ had set them an example by his own declarations and conduct on a certain occasion. When a person addressed him by the name of Good Master, he was rebuked as having done an improper thing.* "Why," says our Saviour, "callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." This censure they believed to have been passed upon him, because Jesus Christ knew that, when the person addressed him by this title, he addressed him not in his divine nature or capacity, but only as a man.

But Jesus Christ not only refused to receive titles of distinction himself, in his human nature, but, on another occasion, exhorted his followers to shun them also. They were not to be like the Scribes and Pharisees, who wished for high and eminent distinctions, that is, to be called Rabbi Rabbi of men; "but," says he, "be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren†;" and he makes the desire, which he discovered in the Jews, of seeking after worldly instead of heavenly honors, to be one cause of their infidelity towards Christ‡; for that such could not believe, as received honor from one another, and sought not the honor, which cometh from God only; that is, that those persons, who courted earthly honors, could not have that humility of mind, that spirit that was to be of no reputation in the world, which was essential to those, who wished to become the followers of Christ.

These considerations, both those of a moral nature, and those of the example of Jesus Christ, weighed so much with the early Quakers, that they made no exceptions even in favor of those of royal dignity, or of the rulers of their own land. George Fox wrote several letters to great men. He wrote twice to the king of Poland, three or four times to Oliver Cromwell, and several times to Charles the Second; but he addressed them in no other manner than by their plain names, or by simple titles expressive of their situations as rulers or as kings.§

---

* Matt. xix. 17. † Matt. xxiii. 8. ‡ John v. 44.

§ The Quakers never refuse the legal titles in the superscription or direction of their letters. They would direct to the king, as king; to a peer, according to his

These several alterations, which took place in the language of the early Quakers, were adopted by their successors, and are in force in the Society at the present day.

SECTION III.

Other alterations in the language—The names of the days and months altered—Reasons for this change—The word Saint disused—Various new phrases introduced.

Another alteration, which took place in the language of the Society, was the disuse of the common names of the days of the week, and of those of the months of the year.

The names of the days were considered to be of Heathen origin. Sunday had been so called by the Saxons, because it was the day on which they sacrificed to the Sun; Monday, on which they sacrificed to the Moon; Tuesday, to the god Tuisco; Wednesday, to the god Woden; Thursday, to the god Thor; and so on. Now, when the Quakers considered that Jehovah had forbidden the Israelites to make mention even of the names of other gods, they thought it inconsistent in Christians to continue to use the names of Heathen idols for the common divisions of their time, so that these names must be almost always in their mouths. They thought, too, that they were paying a homage, in continuing the use of them, that bordered on idolatry. They considered, also, as neither Monday, nor Tuesday, nor any other of these days, were days in which these sacrifices were now offered, they were using words, which conveyed false notions of things. Hence they determined upon the disuse of these words, and to put other names in their stead. The numerical way of naming the days seemed to them to be the most rational, and the most innocent. They called, therefore, Sunday, the First day; Monday, the Second; Tuesday, the Third; and so on to Saturday, which was of course the Seventh. They used no other names but these, either in their conversation or in their letters.

Upon the same principles they altered the names of the months also. Those, such as March and June, which had been so named by the ancient Romans, because they were sacred to Mars and Juno, were exploded, because they seemed, in the use of them, to be expressive of a kind of idolatrous homage. Others, again, were exploded, because they were not the representatives of the truth. September, for example, means the Seventh month from the storms.*

---

rank, either as a duke, marquis, earl, viscount, or baron; to a clergyman, not as reverend, but as clerk.

* Septem ab imbribus.

It took this seventh station in the kalender of Romulus, and it designated there its own station, as well as the reason of its name. But when it lost its place in the kalendar by the alteration of the Style in England, it lost its meaning.† It became no representative of its station, nor any representative of the truth. For it still continues to signify the Seventh month, whereas it is made to represent, or to stand in the place of, the Ninth. The Quakers, therefore, banished from their language the ancient names of the months; and as they thought they could not do better than they had done in the case of the days, they placed numerical in their stead. They called January, the First month; February, the Second; March, the Third; and so on to December, which they called the Twelfth. Thus the Quaker-kalendar was made up by numerical distinctions, which have continued to the present day.

Another alteration, which took place very generally in the language of the Quakers, was the rejection of the word Saint, when they spoke either of the apostles or of the primitive fathers. The papal authority had canonized these. This they considered to be an act of idolatry, and they thought they should be giving a sanction to superstition, if they continued the use of such a title either in their speech or writings. After this, various other alterations took place, according as individuals among them thought it right to expunge old expressions, and to substitute new; and these alterations were adopted by the rest, as they had an opinion of those, who used them, or as they felt the propriety of doing it. Hence, new phrases came into use, different from those, which were used by the world on the same occasions: and these were gradually spread, till they became incorporated into the language of the Society. Of these, the following examples may suffice:

It is not common with the members of this Society to use the words Lucky, or Fortunate, in the way in which many others do. If a Quaker had been out on a journey, and had experienced a number of fine days, he would never say that he had been lucky in his weather. In the same manner, if he had recovered from an indisposition, he would never say, in speaking of the circumstance, that he had Fortunately recovered; but he would say he had recovered, and that it was a Favor. Luck, Chance, or Fortune are not allowed by the Quakers to have any power in the settlement of human affairs.

† This was in the year 1752. Prior to this time the year began on the 25th of March, and therefore September stood in the English as in the Roman kalendar. The early Quakers, however, as we find by a minute in 1697, had made these alterations; but when the New Style was introduced, they published their reasons for having done so.

It is not usual with them to beg ten thousand Pardons, as some of the world do, for any little mistake. A Quaker generally, on such an occasion, asks the person to excuse him.

They never make use of the expression "Christian name." This name is called Christian by the world, because it is the name given to children in baptism, or in other words, when they are christened, or when they are initiated as Christian. But the Quakers are never baptised. They have no belief that water-baptism can make a Christian, or that it is any true mark of membership with the Christian church. Hence, a man's Christian name is called by them his First name, because it is the first of the two, or of any other number of names, that may belong to him.

In meeting a person, they never say "Good morrow," because all days are equally good. Nor, in parting with a person at night, do they say "Good evening," for a similar reason; but they make use in the latter case, of the expression "Farewell."

I might proceed, till I made a little vocabulary of Quaker-expressions; but this is not necessary, and it is not at all consistent with my design. I shall therefore only observe, that it is expected of Quakers that they should use the language of the Society;—that they should substitute Thou for You;—that they should discard all flattering titles and expressions; and that they should adopt the numerical instead of the Heathen names of the days and months. George Fox gave the example himself in all these instances. Those of the Society, who depart from this usage, are said by the Quakers to depart from "the plain language."

SECTION IV.

Great objections by the world against the preceding alterations by the Quakers—first, against the use of Thou for You—Thou, said to be no longer a mark of flattery—the use of it said to be connected with false grammar—custom said to give it, like a noun of number, a singular as well as plural meaning—Consideration of these objections.

There will be no difficulty in imagining, if the Quakers have found fault with the words and expressions adopted by others, and these the great majority of the world, that the world will scrutinize and find fault with those of the Quakers, in return. This, in fact, has turned out to be the case; and I know of no subject, except that of dress, where the world has been more lavish of its censures than in that before us.

When the Quakers first appeared, as a religious community, many objections were thrown out against the peculiarities of their language. These were noticed by Robert Barclay and William Penn.

And since that time other objections have been started. But as these have not been published, (for they remain, where they have usually been, in the mouths of living persons,) Quaker-writers have not felt themselves called upon to attempt to answer them. These objections, however, of both descriptions, I shall notice in the present place.

As the change of the pronoun Thou for You was the first article, that I brought forward on the subject of the language of the Society, I shall begin with the objections that are usually started against it.

"Singularity, it is said, should always be avoided, if it can be done with a clear conscience. The members of this Society might have had honest scruples against You for Thou, when You was a mark of flattery. But they can have no reasonable scruples now, and therefore they should cease to be singular. For the word You is clearly no mark of flattery at the present day. However improper it might once have been, it is now an innocent synonym.

"The use, again, of the word Thou for You, as insisted upon by the Quakers, leads them frequently into false grammar. 'Thee knowest,' and terms like these, are not unusual in their mouths. Now the Quakers, though they defended the use of Thou for You on the notion, that they ought not to accustom their lips to flattery, defended it also strenuously on the notion, that they were strictly adhering to grammar rules. But all such terms as 'Thee knowest; must recoil upon themselves as incorrect, and as censurable, even upon their own ground."

"The word You, again, may be considered as a singular as well as a plural expression. The world use it in this manner. And who are the makers of language but the world? Words change their meaning, as the leaves their color in autumn: and custom has always been found powerful enough to give authority for a change."

With respect to these objections, it must be confessed that the word You has certainly so far lost its meaning, as to be no longer a mark of flattery, and therefore the Quakers have lost one of their reasons for its disuse. It must be confessed also, that the members of this Society frequently adopt the ungrammatical expressions, that have been brought against them. But surely all such lose another of their reasons for their disuse of this pronoun. They should either endeavor to speak more correctly, or give up the grammatical part of the defence by Penn and Barclay, and conform to the practice of the world. That You, however, is of the singular number, is not quite so clear. You and Thou have certainly a concurrent jurisdiction, but they have it only by custom through a length of time. For while Thou is used in the singular number in the Bible, and in the Liturgy, and in the prayers of individuals; and while it is the lan-

guage, as it is, of a great portion of the inhabitants of the northern part of the kingdom, it will be a standing monument against the usurpation and dominion of You.

SECTION V.

Secondly, against the words Friend and Neighbor, as used by the Quakers—Quakers also said to be wrong in their disuse of titles—for the use of these is sanctioned by St. Luke and St. Paul—Answer of Barclay to the latter assertion—this answer not generally deemed satisfactory—Observations upon the subject in dispute.

THE subject, which comes next in order, will be that of the Objections that are usually made against certain Terms used by the Society, and against its Disuse of Titles of Honor, as sanctioned by the world.

On the use of the words "Friend," and "Neighbor," it is usually observed, that these are too limited in their meaning, to be always, if used promiscuously, representatives of the truth. If the Quakers are so nice, that they will use no expression that is not precisely true, they should invent additional terms, which should express the relative condition of those, with whom they converse. The word "Friend" denotes esteem; and the word "Neighbor," proximity of dwelling. But all the persons, to whom the Quakers address themselves, are not persons whom they love and respect, or who are the inhabitants of the same neighborhood with themselves. There is, it is said, as much untruth in calling a man Friend, or Neighbor, who is not so, as Excellency, in whom there may be nothing that is excellent.

The Quakers, in reply to this, would observe, that they use the word Friend as significative of their own union, and, when they speak to others, as significative of their Christian relation one to another. In the same sense they use the word Neighbor. Jesus Christ, when the lawyer asked him who was his neighbor, gave him a short history of the Samaritan,* who fell among thieves; from which he suggested an inference, that the term Neighbor was not confined to those, who lived near one another, or belonged to the same sect, but that it might extend to those, who lived at a distance, and to the Samaritan equally with the Jew. In the same manner he considered all men as brethren†: that is, they were thus scripturally related to one another.

Another objection, which has been raised against the Society on this part of the subject, is levelled against its disuse of the titles of

---

* Luke x. 29. † Matt. xxiii. 8.

honor of the world. St. Luke, it has been said, makes use of the term Most Excellent, when he addresses Theophilus; and St. Paul, of the words Most Noble, when he addresses Festus. Now these teachers and promulgators of Christianity would never have given these titles, if they had not been allowable by the Gospel.

As this last argument was used in the time of Barclay, he has noticed it in his celebrated Apology:—"Since Luke," says he, "wrote by the dictates of the infallible spirit of God, I think it will not be doubted but Theophilus did deserve it, as being really endued with that virtue; in which case we shall not condemn those, who do it by the same rule. But it is not proved that Luke gave Theophilus this title, as that which was inherent to him either by his father or by any patent Theophilus had obtained from any of the princes of the earth, or that he would have given it to him in case he had not been truly Excellent; and without this be proved, which never can, there can nothing hence be deduced against us. The like may be said of that of Paul to Festus, whom he would not have called such, if he had not been truly Noble; as indeed he was, in that he suffered him to be heard in his own cause, and would not give way to the fury of the Jews against him. It was not because of any outward title bestowed upon Festus that he so called him, else he would have given the same compellation to his predecessor Felix, who had the same office; but, being a covetous man, we find he gives him no such title."

This is the answer of Barclay. It has, however, not been deemed quite satisfactory by the world. It has been observed against it, that one good action will never give a man a right to a general title. This is undoubtedly an observation of some weight. But it must be contended, on the other hand, that both Luke and Paul must have been apprised that the religion, they were so strenuous in propagating, required every man to speak the truth. They must have been apprised, also, that it inculcated humility of mind. And it is probable, therefore, that they would never have bestowed titles upon men, which should have been false in their application, or productive of vanity and pride. St. Luke could not be otherwise than aware of the answer of Jesus Christ, when he rebuked the person for giving him the title of Good, because he was one of the evangelists who recorded it*. And St. Paul could not have been otherwise than aware of it also, on account of his intimacy with St. Luke, as well as from other causes.

Neither has this answer of Barclay been considered as satisfactory

* Luke xviii. 18.

for another reason. It has been presumed that the expressions of Excellent, and of Noble, were established titles of rank; and if an evangelist and an apostle used them, they could not be objectionable if used by others. But, in reply to this, let us admit for a moment that they were titles of rank. How happens it that St. Paul, when he was before Festus, and not in a judicial capacity, (for he had been reserved for Cæsar's tribunal,) should have given him this epithet of Noble; and that, when summoned before Felix, and this in a judicial capacity, he should have omitted it? This application of it to the one, and not to the other, either implies that it was no title; or, if it was a title, as has been presumed, that St. Paul had some reason for this partial use of it. And in this case no better reason can be given, than that suggested by Barclay. St. Paul knew that Festus had done his duty. He knew, on the other hand, the abandoned character of Felix. The latter was then living, as Josephus relates, in open adultery with Drucilla, who had been married to Azis, and brought away from her husband by the help of Simon, a magician. And this circumstance, probably, gave occasion to Paul to dwell upon temperance, (or continence, as the word might be rendered,) among other subjects, when he made Felix tremble. But, besides this, he must have known the general character of a man, of whom Tacitus complained that "his government was distinguished by servility, and every species of cruelty and lust*." If, therefore, the epithet of Noble was an established title for those Romans, who held the government of Judæa, the giving of it to one, and the omission of it to the other, would probably show the discrimination of St. Paul as a Christian, that he had no objection to give it where it could be applied with truth, but that he refused it where it was not applicable to the living character.

But that the expression of Excellent, or of Noble, was any title at all, there is no evidence to show. And first, let us examine the word, which was used upon this occasion. The original Greek word has no meaning as a title in any lexicon that I have seen. It relates both to personal and civil power; and, in a secondary sense, to the strength and disposition of the mind. It occurs but in four places in the New Testament. In two of these it is translated Excellent, and in the others, Noble. But Gilbert Wakefield, one of our best scholars, has expunged the word Noble, and substituted Excellent, throughout. Indeed, of all the meanings of this word, Noble is the least proper. No judgment, therefore, can be pronounced in favor of a title by any analysis of this word.

---

* Per omnem sævitiam et libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit.

Let us now examine it as used by St. Luke. And here almost every consideration makes against it, as an established title. In the first place, the wisest commentators do not know who Theophilus was. It has been supposed by many learned Fathers, such as Epiphanius, Salvian, and others, that St. Luke, in addressing his Gospel to Theophilus, addressed it, as the words "Excellent Theophilus" import, to every "firm lover of God," or, if St. Luke uses the style of Athanasius, to every "good Christian." But on the supposition that Theophilus had been a living character, and a man in power, the use of the epithet is against it, as a title of rank; because St. Luke gives it to Theophilus in the beginning of his Gospel, and does not give it to him when he addresses him in the Acts. If, therefore, he had addressed him in this manner, because Excellent was his proper title on one occasion, it would have been a kind of legal, and at any rate a disrespectful, omission, not to have given it him on the other.

With respect to the term Noble, as used by St. Paul to Festus, the sense of it must be determined by general as well as by particular considerations. There are two circumstances, which, at the first sight, make in favor of it as a title. Lysias* addresses his letter to the "most Excellent Felix," and the orator Tertullus† says, "We accept it always, and in all places, most Noble Felix!" But there must be some drawback from the latter circumstance, as an argument of weight. There is reason to suppose that this expression was used by Tertullus as a piece of flattery, to compass the death of Paul; for it is of a piece with the other expressions, which he used, when he talked of the "worthy deeds" done by the providence of so detestable a wretch as Felix. And it will always be an objection to Noble, as a legal title, that St. Paul gave it to one governor, and omitted it to another, except he did it for the reasons that have been before described.

To these observations we may add another, which will be of considerable importance in this dispute, namely, that legal titles of eminence were not then, as at this day, in use. Agrippa had no other, or at least Paul gave him no other, title than that of King. If Porcius Festus had been descended from a Patrician, or had had the statues of his ancestors, he might, on these accounts, be said to have been of a Noble family. But we know that nobody, on this account, would have addressed him as Noble in those days, either by speech or letter. The first Roman, who was ever honored with a legal title, as a title of distinction, was Octavius, upon whom the

---

*Acts xxiii. 26. †Acts xxiv. 3.

Senate, but a few years before the birth of Paul, had conferred the name of Augustus. But no procurator of a province took this title. Neither does it appear that this circumstance gave birth to inferior titles to those in inferior offices in the government. And indeed on the title "Augustus" it may be observed, that though it followed the successors of Octavius, it was but sparingly used, being mostly used on medals, monumental pillars, and in public acts of the State. Pliny, in his Letters to Trajan, though reputed an excellent prince, addressed him only as Sir, or Master; and he wrote many years after the death of Paul. Athenagoras, in addressing his book, in times posterior to these, to the emperors M. Aurelius Antoninus and L. Aurelius Commodus, addresses them only by the title of "Great Princes." In short, titles were not in use. They did not creep in, so as to be commonly used, till after the statues of the emperors had begun to be worshipped by the military as a legal and accustomary homage. The terms of Eternity and Divinity, with others, were then ushered in, but these were confined wholly to the emperors themselves. In the time of Constantine, we find the title of Illustrious. This was given to those princes, who had distinguished themselves in war, but it was not continued to their descendants. In process of time, however, it became more common, and the son of every prince began to be called Illustrious.

SECTION VI.

Thirdly, against the alteration of the names of the days and months—People, it is said, do not necessarily pay homage to idols, who continue in the use of the ancient names—If the Quaker-principles, also, were generally adopted on this subject, language would be thrown into confusion—Quakers, also, by attempting to steer clear of idolatry, fall into it—Replies of the Quakers to these objections.

The next objections for consideration, which are made against the language of the Society, are those, which relate to their alteration of the names of the Days and the Months. These objections are commonly made, when the language of the Quakers becomes a subject of conversation with the world.

"There is great absurdity, it is said, in supposing that persons pay any respect to Heathen idols, who retain the use of the ancient names of the divisions of time. How many thousands are there, who know nothing of their origin! The common people of the country know none of the reasons why the months and days are called as they are. The middle classes are mostly ignorant of the same. They, who are well informed on the subject, never once think, when they mention the months and days, on the reason of the rise of their names. In-

deed the almost hourly use of those names secures the oblivion of their origin. Who, when he speaks of Wednesday and Thursday, thinks that these were the days sacred to Woden and Thor? But there can be no idolatry, where there is no intention to idolize."

"Great weakness, it is said again, is manifested by the Quakers, in quarrelling with a few words in the language, and in living at peace with others, which are equally objectionable. Every reason, it is said, must be a weak one, which is not universal. But if some of the reasons given by the Quakers were universally applied, they would throw language into as much confusion as the builders of Babel. The word Smith, for example, which is the common name of many families, ought to be objected to by this rule, if the person, to whom it belongs, happens to be a carpenter. And the word Carpenter, which is likewise a family name, ought to be objected to, if the person so called should happen to be a smith. And, in this case, men would be obliged to draw lots for numbers, and to be called by the numerical ticket, which they should draw."

"It is objected, again, to the Quakers, that by attempting to steer clear of idolatry they fall into it. They are considered to be genuine idolaters in this case. The blind Pagan imagined a moral being, either heavenly or infernal, to inhere in a log of wood or a block of stone. The Quakers, in like manner, imagine a moral being, Truth or Falsehood, to exist in a lifeless word, and this independently of the sense in which it is spoken, and in which it is known that it will be understood. What is this, it is said, but a species of idolatry, and a degrading superstition?"

The Quakers would reply to these observations: First, that they do not charge others with idolatry in the use of these names, who know nothing of their origin, or who feel no impropriety in their use.

Secondly, that if the principle, upon which they found their alterations in language, cannot, on account of existing circumstances, be followed in all cases, there is no reason why it should not be followed where it can. In the names of men, it would be impossible to adopt it. Old people are going off, and young people are coming up, and people of all descriptions are themselves changing; and a change of names to suit every person, condition, and qualification, would be impossible.

Thirdly, that they pay no more homage or obeisance to words, than the obeisance of truth. There is always a propriety in truth, and an impropriety in falsehood. And in proportion as the names of things accord with their essences, qualities, properties, characters, and the like, they are more or less proper. September, for example,

is not an appropriate name, if its meaning be inquired into, for the month which it represents: but the Ninth Month is, and the latter appellation will stand the test of the strictest inquiry.

They would say, again, that this, as well as the other alterations in their language, has had a moral influence on the Society, and has been productive of moral good. In the same manner as the dress, which they received from their ancestors, has operated as a guardian or preservative of virtue, so has the language which they received from them also. This language has made the world overseers of the conduct of the Society. A Quaker is known by it as much as by his dress. It operates, by discovering him, as a check upon his actions. It keeps him, also, like the dress, distinct from others. And the Quakers believe that they can never keep up their Christian discipline, except they keep clear of the spirit of the world. Hence it has been considered as of great importance to keep up the plain language. And this importance has been further manifested by circumstances, that have taken place within the pale of the Society. For, in the same manner as they, who begin to depart from the simplicity of dress, are generally in a way to go off among the world, so are those, who depart from the simplicity of the language. Each deviation is a sign of a temper for desertion. Each deviation brings them in appearance nearer to the world. But the nearer they resemble the world in this respect, the more they are found to mix with it. They are of course the more likely to be seduced from the wholesome prohibitions of the Society. The language, therefore, of the Quakers has grown up insensibly as a wall of partition, which could not now, it is contended, be taken away, without endangering the innocence of their youth.

SECTION VII.

Advantages and disadvantages of the system of the Quaker-language—Disadvantages are, that it may lead to superstition and hypocrisy—Advantages are, that it excludes flattery—is founded upon truth—promotes truth, and correctness in the expression of ideas—Observation of Hobbes—would be the most perfect model for an universal kalendar—The use or disuse of this system may, either of them, be made beneficial to morality.

I have now given to the reader the objections that are usually made to the alterations, which the Quakers have introduced into the language of the country, as well as the replies which they themselves would make to these objections. I shall solicit the continuance of his patience a little longer, or till I have made a few remarks of my own upon this subject.

It certainly becomes people, who introduce great peculiarities into

their system, to be careful that these are well founded, and to consider how far they may bring their minds into bondage, or what moral effects they may produce on their character in a course of time.

On the reformed language of the Society it may be observed, that both advantages and disadvantages may follow, according to the due or undue estimation, in which individuals may hold it.

If individuals should lay too great a stress upon language, that is, if they should carry their prejudices so far against outward and lifeless words, that they should not dare to pronounce them, and this as a matter of religion, they are certainly in the way of becoming superstitious, and of losing the dignified independence of their minds.

If, again, they should put an undue estimate upon language, so as to consider it as a criterion of religious purity, they may be encouraging the growth of hypocrisy within their own precincts. For if the use of this reformed language be considered as an essential of religion, that is, if men be highly thought of in proportion as they conform to it rigidly, it may be a covering to many to neglect the weightier matters of righteousness. At least, the fulfilling of such minor duties may shield them from the suspicion of neglecting the greater: and if they should be reported as erring in the latter case, their crime would be less credited under their observance of these minutiæ of the law.

These effects are likely to result to the Society, if the peculiarities of their language be insisted on beyond their due bounds. But, on the other hand, it must be confessed, that advantages are likely to follow from the same system, which are of great importance in themselves, and which may be set off as a counterbalance to the disadvantages described.

The Quakers may say, and this with the greatest truth, "We have never cringed or stooped below the dignity of men. We have never been guilty of base flattery. We have never been instrumental in raising the creature, with whom we have conversed, above his condition, so that, in the imagination of his own consequence, he should lose sight of his dependence on the Supreme Being, or treat his fellow-men, because they should happen to be below him, as worms or reptiles of the earth."

They may say, also, that the system of their language originated in the purest motives, and that it is founded on the sacred basis of truth.

It may be said, also, that the habits of caution, which the different peculiarities in their language have introduced and interwoven into

their constitutions, have taught them particularly to respect the truth, and to aim at it in all their expressions, whether by speech or letters; and that it has given them a peculiar correctness in the expression of their ideas, which they would never have had by means of the ordinary education of the world. Hobbes says, "Animadverte, quam sit ab improprietate verborum pronum hominibus prolabi in errores circa res!"* or, "How prone men are to fall into errors about things, when they use improper expressions!" The converse of this proposition may be observed to be true with respect to the Quakers, or it may be observed that the study of proper expressions has given them correct conceptions of things, and has had an influence in favor of truth. There are no people, though the common notion may be otherwise, who speak so accurately as the Quakers; or whose letters, if examined on any subject, would be so free from any double meaning, so little liable to be mistaken, and so easy to be understood.

It may be observed, also, on the language of the Society, that is, on that part of it, which relates to the alteration of the names of the months and days, that this alteration would form the most perfect model for an universal kalendar of any that has yet appeared in the world. The French nation chose to alter their kalendar; and, to make it useful to husbandry, they designated their months so that they should be representatives of the different seasons of the year. They called them Snowy, and Windy, and Harvest, and Vintage-months, and the like. But in so large a territory as that of France, these new designations were not the representatives of the truth. The northern and southern parts were not alike in their climate; much less could these designations speak the truth for other parts of the world: whereas numerical appellations might be adopted with truth, and be attended with usefulness to all the nations of the world, who divided their time in the same manner.

On the latter subject, of the names of the days and months, the alteration of which is considered as the most objectionable by the world, I shall only observe, that if the Quakers have religious scruples concerning them, it is their duty to persevere in the disuse of them. Others, on the other hand, who have no such scruples, are under no obligation to follow their example. And in the same manner as the Quakers convert the disuse of these ancient terms to the improvement of their moral character, so those of the world may convert the use of them to a moral purpose. Man is a reasonable and moral being, and capable of moral improvement; and this im-

*Hobbesii Examen et Emend. Hod. Math. p. 55, edit. Amstel.

provement may be made to proceed from apparently worthless causes. If, for example, we were to find crosses or other Roman-Catholic relics fixed in the walls of our places of worship, why should we displace them? Why should we not rather suffer them to remain, to put us in mind of the necessity of thankfulness for the reformation in our religion? If, again, we were to find an altar, which had been sacred to Moloch, but which had been turned into a stepping-stone to help the aged and infirm upon their horses, why should we destroy it? Might it not be made useful to our morality, as far as it could be made to excite sorrow for the past, and gratitude for the present? And, in the same manner, might it not be edifying to retain the use of the ancient names of the days and months? Might not thankful feelings be excited in our hearts, that the crime of idolatry had ceased among us, and that the only remnant of it was a useful signature of the times? In fact, if it be the tendency of the corrupt part of our nature to render innocent things vicious; it is, on the other hand, in the essence of our nature to render vicious things in process of time innocent; so that even the remnants of idolatry and superstition may be made subservient to the moral improvement of mankind.

CHAPTER IV.

Address—All nations have used ceremonies of address—George Fox bears his testimony against those in use in his own times—sufferings of the Quakers on this account—makes no exception in favor of royalty—his dispute with Judge Glynn—Modern Quakers follow his example—use no ceremonies even to Majesty—various reasons for their disuse of them.

All nations have been in the habit of using outward gestures or ceremonies, as marks of affection, obeisance, or respect. And these outward ceremonies have been different from one another; so much so, that those, which have been adjudged to be suitable emblems of certain affections or dispositions of the mind among one people, would have been considered as very improper emblems of the same, and would have been even thought ridiculous, by another. Yet all nations have supposed that they employed the most rational modes for these purposes. And indeed there were probably none of these outward gestures and ceremonies, which in their beginning would not have admitted of a reasonable defence. While they continued to convey to the minds of those, who adopted them, the objects for

which they were intended, or while those, who used them, persevered with sincerity in their use, little or no objection could be made to them by the moralist. But as soon as the ends of their institution were lost, or they were used without any appropriate feeling of the heart, they became empty civilities, and little better than mockery or grimace.

The customs of this sort, which obtained in the time of George Fox, were similar to those which are now in use on similar occasions. People took off their hats, and bowed, and scraped with their feet. And these things they did as marks of civility, friendship, or respect to one another.

George Fox was greatly grieved about these idle ceremonies. He lamented that men should degrade themselves by the use of them, and that they should encourage habits that were abhorrent of the truth. His feelings were so strong upon this subject, that he felt himself called upon to bear his testimony against them. Accordingly, he never submitted to them himself; and those, who received his religious doctrines, followed his example.

The omission of these ceremonies, however, procured both for him and his followers, as had been the case in the change of Thou for You, much ill-will and harsh treatment. The Quakers were derided and abused. Their hats were taken forcibly from their heads, and thrown away. They were beaten and imprisoned on this sole account. And so far did the world carry their resentment towards them for the omission of these little ceremonies, that they refused for some time to deal with them as tradesmen, or to buy things at their shops; so that some Quakers could hardly get money enough to buy themselves bread.

George Fox, however, and his associates, persevered in the disuse of all honors, either by the moving of the hat, or the usual bendings of the body; and as, if it were morally right to dispense with any custom towards one, it would be so to dispense with it towards another, they made no exception even in favor of the chief magistrate of the land. George Fox, when he visited Oliver Cromwell, as Protector, never took off his hat: and it is remarkable that the Protector was not angry with him for it.

Neither did he take off his hat to the Judges at any time, notwithstanding that he was so often brought before them. Controversies sometimes took place between him and them in the public court upon these occasions; one of which I shall notice, as it marks the manner of conducting the jurisprudence of those times.

When George Fox and two other Friends were brought out of Launceston gaol to be tried before Judge Glynn, who was then

chief justice of England, they came into court with their hats on. The Judge asked them the reason of this; but they said nothing. He then desired them to pull off their hats; but they still said nothing. He then told them that the Court commanded them to pull off their hats. Upon this, George Fox addressed them in the following manner: "Where," says he, "did ever any magistrate, king, or judge, from Moses to Daniel, command any to put off their hats when they came before them in their courts, either amongst the Jews, who were God's people, or among the Heathen? And if the law of England doth command any such thing, show me that law, either written or printed." Judge Glynn upon this grew angry. and replied, that "he did not carry his law-books upon his back."—"But," says George Fox, "tell me where it is printed in any statute-book, that I may read it." The Judge, in a vulgar manner, ordered him away; and he was accordingly taken away, and put among thieves. The Judge, however, in a short time afterwards ordered him up again, and on his return put to him the following question: "Come," says he, "where had they hats, from Moses to Daniel? Come, answer me. I have you fast now." George Fox replied, that "he might read in the third chapter of Daniel that the three children were cast into the fiery furnace, by Nebuchadnezzar's command, with their coats, their hose, and their hats on," The repetition of this apposite text stopped the Judge from any further comments on the custom, and he ordered him and his companions to be taken away again. And they were accordingly taken away, and were thrust again among thieves. In process of time, however, this custom of the Quakers began to be known among the Judges; who so far respected their scruples, as to take care that their hats should be taken off in future in the court.

These omissions of the ceremonies of the world, as begun by the primitive members of the Society, are continued by the modern. They neither bow, nor scrape, nor take off their hats, to any by way of civility or respect; and they carry their principles, like their predecessors, so far, that they observe none of those exterior parts of politeness even in the presence of royalty. The Quakers are in the habit, on particular occasions, of sending deputies to the King. And it is remarkable that his present Majesty always sees them himself, if he be well, and not by proxy. Notwithstanding this, no one in the deputation ever takes off his hat. Those, however, who are in waiting in the antichamber, knowing this custom of the Quakers, take their hats from their heads, before they enter the room where the King is. On entering the room they neither bow, nor scrape, nor kneel; and as this ceremony cannot be performed for them by

others, they go into the royal presence in a less servile or more dignified manner than either the representatives of sovereigns, or those who have humbled nations by the achievement of great victories.

The ground, upon which the Quakers decline the use of the ordinary ceremonies just mentioned, is, that these are the honors of the world. Now, as the honors of the world, they consider them as objectionable on several accounts.

First, they hold them to be no more the criterions of obeisance and respect, than they hold mourning garments to be the criterions of sorrow. But Christianity is never satisfied but with the truth. It forbids all false appearances. It allows no image to be held out, that is not a faithful picture of its original, or no action to be resorted to, that is not correspondent with the feelings of the heart.

In the second place, they presume that, as honours of the world, all such ceremonies are generally of a complimentary nature. No one bows to a poor man; but almost every one to the rich; and the rich to one another. Hence, bowing is as much a species of flattery through the medium of the body, as the giving of undeserved titles through the medium of the tongue.

As honors of the world, again, they think them censurable, because all such honors were censured by Jesus Christ. On the occasion, on which he exhorted his followers not to be like the Scribes and Pharisees, and to seek flattering titles, so as to be called Rabbi Rabbi of men, he exhorted them to avoid all ceremonious salutations, such as greetings in the market-places. He couples the two different customs of flattering titles and salutations in the same sentence, and mentions them in the same breath. And though the word "Greetings" does not perhaps precisely mean those bowings and scrapings, which are used at the present day, yet it means, both according to its derivation and the nature of the Jewish customs, those outward personal actions or gestures, which were used as complimentary by the Jewish world.

With respect to taking off the hat, the Quakers have an additional objection to this custom, quite distinct from the objections that have been mentioned above. Every minister in the Quaker-Society takes off his hat either when he preaches or when he prays. St. Paul enjoins this custom.* But if they take off their hats, that is, uncover their heads, as an outward act enjoined in the service of God, they cannot with any propriety take them off, or uncover their heads, to men, because they would be giving to the creature the same outward honor, which they give to the Creator. And in this custom they

* 1 Cor. chap xi.

conceive the world to be peculiarly inconsistent. For men go into their churches, and into their meetings, and take off their hats, or uncover their heads, for the same reason as the Quaker-ministers when they pray (for no other reason can be assigned) and when they come out of their respective places of worship they uncover them again, on every trivial occasion, to those whom they meet, using to man the same outward mark of homage as they had just given to God.

CHAPTER V.

Manners and conversation—Quakers esteemed reserved—this an appearance owing to their education—their hospitality in they own houses—the freedom allowed and taken—their conversation limited—politics generally excluded—Subjects of conversation examined in our towns—also in the metropolis—no such subjects among the Quakers—their conversation more dignified—Extraordinary circumstance, that takes place occasionally in the company of the Quakers.

The Quakers are generally supposed to be a stiff and reserved people, and to be a people of severe and uncourteous manners. I confess there is something in their appearance, that will justify the supposition in the eyes of strangers, and of such as do not know them: I mean, of such as just see them occasionally out of doors, but do not mix with them in their houses.

It cannot be expected that persons, educated like the Quakers, should assimilate much in their manners to other people. The very dress they wear, which is so different from that of others, would give them a stiff appearance in the eyes of the world, if nothing else could be found to contribute towards it. Excluded also from much intercourse with the world, and separated at a vast distance from it by the singularity of many of their customs, they would naturally appear to others to be close and reserved. Neither is it to be expected that those, whose spirits are never animated by music, or enlivened by the exhibitions of the theatre, or the diversions which others follow, would have other than grave countenances. Their discipline, also, which calls them so frequently to important duties, and the dispatch of serious business, would produce the same feature. I may observe, also, that a peculiarity of gait, which might be mistaken for awkwardness, might not unreasonably be expected in those, who had neither learned to walk under the guidance of a danc-

ing-master, nor to bow under the direction of the dominion of fashion. If those and those only are to be esteemed really polished and courteous, who bow, and scrape, and salute each other by certain prescribed gestures, then the members of this Society will appear to have contracted some rust, and to have an indisputable right to the title of a clownish and inflexible people.

I must observe, however, that these appearances, though they may be substantial in the estimation of those, who do not know them, gradually vanish with those, who do. Their hospitality, in their own houses, and their great attention and kindness, soon force out of sight all ideas of uncourteousness. Their freedom, also, soon annihilates those of stiffness and reserve. Their manners, though they have not the polished surface of those, which are usually attached to fashionable life, are agreeable when known.

There is one trait in the Quaker-manners, which runs through the whole Society, as far as I have seen in their houses, and which is worthy of mention. The Quakers appear to be particularly gratified, when those, who visit them, ask for what they want. Instead of considering this as rudeness or intrusion, they esteem it a favor done them. The circumstance of asking on such an occasion is to them a proof that their visitors feel themselves at home. Indeed, they almost always desire a stranger, who has been introduced to them, "to be free." This is their usual expression. And if he assures them that he will, and if they find him asking for what he wishes to have, you may perceive in their countenances the pleasure which his conduct has given them. They consider him, when he has used this freedom, to have acted, as they express it, "kindly." Nothing can be more truly polite than that conduct to another, by which he shall be induced to feel himself as comfortably situated as if he were in his own house.

As the Quakers desire their visitors to be free, and to do as they please, so they do not fail to do the same themselves, never regarding such visitors as impediments in the way of their concerns. If they have any business or engagement out of doors, they say so and go, using no ceremony, and but few words as an apology. Their visitors, I mean such as stay for a time in their houses, are left in the interim to amuse themselves as they please. This is peculiarly agreeable, because their friends know when they visit them, that they neither restrain, nor shackle, nor put them to inconvenience. In fact, it may be truly said, that if satisfaction in visiting depends upon a man's own freedom to do as he likes, to ask and to call for what he wants, to go out and come in as he pleases; and if it depends also on the knowledge he has, that in doing all these things he

puts no person out of his way, there are no houses where people will be better pleased with their treatment, than in those belonging to the members of this Society.

This trait in the character of its members is very general. I would not pretend, however, to say it is universal: but it is quite general enough to be pronounced a feature in their domestic character. I do not mean, by the mention of it, to apologize in any manner for the ruggedness of manners of some Quakers. There are undoubtedly solitary families, which having lived in places where there have been scarcely any of their own Society with whom to associate, and which having scarcely mixed with others of other denominations, except in the way of trade, have an uncourteousness. ingrafted in them as it were by these circumstances, which no change of situation afterwards has been able to obliterate.

The subjects of conversation among the Quakers differ, like those of others; but they are not so numerous, neither are they of the same kind as those of other people.

Their conversation is usually cramped or fettered, for two reasons; first, by the caution, that prevails among the members of the Society, relative to the use of idle words; and, secondly, by the caution that prevails among them relative to the adapting of their expressions to the truth. Hence the primitive Quakers were persons of few words.

The subjects also of their conversation are limited for several reasons. The Quakers have not in general the same classical or philosophical education, as persons of other denominations. This circumstance will of course exclude many topics from their discourse

Religious considerations also exclude others. Politics, which generally engross a good deal of attention, and which afford an inexhaustible fund of matter for conversation to a great part of the inhabitants of the island, are seldom introduced, and, if introduced, very tenderly handled in general among this Society. I have seen aged Quakers gently reprove others of tenderer years, with whom they happened to be in company, for having started them. It is not that the Quakers have not the same feelings as other men, or that they are not equally interested about humanity, or that they are incapable of opinions on the changeable political events that are passing over the face of the globe, that this subject is so little agitated among them. They are usually silent upon it for particular reasons. They consider, first, that as they are not allowed to have any direction, and in many cases could not conscientiously interfere. in government-matters, it would be folly to disquiet their minds with vain and fruitless speculations. They consider, again, that political subjects frequently irritate people, and make them warm. Now this

is a temper, which they consider to be peculiarly detrimental to their religion. They consider themselves, also, in this life, as on a journey to another, and that they should get through it as quietly and inoffensively as they can. They believe, again, with George Fox, that, "in these lower regions, or in this airy life, all news is uncertain. There is nothing stable. But in the higher regions, or in the kingdom of Christ, all things are stable; and the news is always good and certain*."

As politics do not afford matter for much conversation in the Quaker-Society, so neither do some other subjects that may be mentioned.

In a country-town, where people daily visit, it is not uncommon to observe, whether at the card- or the tea-table, that what is usually called Scandal forms a part of the pleasures of conversation. The hatching up of suspicions on the accidental occurrence of trivial circumstances,—the blowing up of these suspicions into substances and forms,—animadversions on characters,—these, and such-like themes, wear out a great part of the time of an afternoon or an evening visit. Such subjects, however, cannot enter where Quakers converse with one another. To avoid tale-bearing and detraction is a lesson inculcated into them in early youth. The maxim is incorporated into their religion, and of course follows them through life. It is contained in one of their Queries. This Query is read to them in their meetings, and the subject of it is therefore repeatedly brought to their notice and recollection. Add to which, that if a member were to repeat any unfounded scandal, that operated te the injury of another's character, and were not to give up the author, or make satisfaction for the same, he would be liable, by the rules of the Society, to be disowned.

I do not mean to assert here that a person of this Society never says a harsh thing of another man. All, who profess to be, are not Quakers. Subjects of a scandalous nature may be introduced by others of another denomination, in which, if Quakers are present, they may unguardedly join. But it is certainly true, that Quakers are more upon their guard with respect to scandalizing others than many other people. Nor is this unlikely to be the case, when we consider that caution in this particular is required of them by the laws of their religion. It is certainly true, also, that such subjects are never introduced by them, like those at country tea-tables, for the sole purpose of producing conversation. And I believe I may

* There is always an exception in favor of conversation on politics, which is, when the Government are agitating any question, in which their religious freedom or their interests are involved.

add with truth, that it would even be deemed extraordinary by the Society, if such subjects were introduced by them at all.

In companies, also, in the metropolis, as well as in country towns, a variety of subjects afford food for conversation, which never enter into the discourse of the Quakers.

If we were to go into the company of persons of a certain class in the metropolis, we should find them deriving the enjoyments of conversation from some such subjects as the following: One of the company would probably talk of the exquisitely fine manner in which an actress performed her part on a certain night. This would immediately give birth to a variety of remarks. The name of one actress would bring up that of another; and the name of one play that of another; till at length the stage would become the source of supplying a subject for a considerable time. Another would probably ask, as soon as this theatrical discuision was over, the opinion of the company on the subject of the duel, which the morning papers had reported to have taken place. This new subject would give new fuel to the fire, and new discussions would take place, and new observations fly about from all quarters. Some would applaud the courage of the person who had been killed; others would pity his hard fate: but none would censure his wickedness for having resorted to such dreadful means for the determination of his dispute. From this time the laws of honor would be canvassed, and disquisitions about punctilio, and etiquette, and honor, would arrest the attention of the company, and supply them with materials for a time. These subjects would be followed by observations on fashionable head-dresses, by the relation of elopements, by the reports of affairs of gallantry. Each subject would occupy its own portion of time. Thus each would help to swell up the measure of conversation, and to make up the enjoyment of the visit.

If we were to go among persons of another class in the metropolis, we should probably find them collecting their entertainment from new topics. One would talk on the subject of some splendid rout. He would expatiate on the number of rooms that were opened, on the superb manner in which they were fitted up, and on the sum of money that was expended in procuring every delicacy that was out of season. A second would probably ask, if it were really known, how much one of their female acquaintance had lost at faro. A third would make observations on the dresses at the last drawing-room. A fourth would particularize the liveries brought out by individuals on the Birth-day. A fifth would ask who was to have the vacant red riband. Another would tell how the minister had given a certain place to a certain nobleman's third son, and would observe that

the whole family were now provided for by Government. Each of these topics would be enlarged upon, as successively started; and thus conversation would be kept going during the time of the visit.

These and other subjects generally constitute the pleasures of conversation among certain classes of persons. But among the Quakers they can hardly even intrude themselves as topics at all. Places and pensions they neither do nor can hold. Levees and drawing-rooms they neither do nor would consent to attend, on pleasure. Red ribands they would not wear if given to them. As to splendid liveries, these would never occupy their attention. Liveries for servants, though not expressly forbidden, are not congenial with the spirit of the Quaker system. And as to gaming, plays, or fashionable amusements, these are forbidden, as I have amply stated before, by the laws of the Society.

It is obvious, then, that these topics cannot easily enter into conversation where Quakers are. Indeed, nothing so trifling, ridiculous, or disgusting, occupies their minds. The subjects, that take up their attention, are of a more solid and useful kind. There is a dignity, in general, in their conversation, arising from the nature of these subjects, and from the gravity and decorum with which it is always conducted. It is not to be inferred from hence that their conversation is dull and gloomy. There is often no want of sprightliness, wit, and humor. But then this sprightliness never borders upon folly, (for all foolish jesting is to be avoided,) and it is always decorous. When vivacity makes its appearance among the members of this Society, it is sensible, and it is uniformly in an innocent and a decent dress.

In the company of the Quakers a circumstance sometimes occurs, of so peculiar a nature, that it cannot well be omitted in this place. It sometimes happens that you observe a pause in the conversation. This pause continues. Surprised at the universal silence now prevailing, you look round, and find all the members in the room apparently thoughtful. The history of the circumstance is this: In the course of the conversation, the mind of some one of the persons present has been either so overcome with the weight or importance of it, or so overcome by inward suggestions on other subjects, as to have given himself up to meditation, or to passive obedience to impressions upon his mind. This person is soon discovered by the rest, on account of his particular silence and gravity. From this moment the Quakers in company cease to converse. They become habitually silent, and continue so, both old and young, to give the apparently meditating person an opportunity of pursuing uninterruptedly the train of his own thoughts. Perhaps, in the course of his meditations,

the subject, that impressed his mind, gradually dies away, and expires in silence. In this case you find him resuming his natural position, and returning to conversation with the company as before. It sometimes happens, however, that, in the midst of his meditations, he feels an impulse to communicate to those present the subject of his thoughts, and breaks forth, seriously explaining, exhorting, and advising, as the nature of it permits and suggests. When he has finished his observations, the company remain silent for a short time; after which they converse again as before.

Such a pause, whenever it occurs in the company of the Quakers, may be considered as a devotional act. For the subject, which occasions it, is always of a serious or religious nature. The workings in the mind of the meditating person are considered either as the offspring of a solemn reflection upon that subject, suddenly and almost involuntarily, as it were, produced by duty, or as the immediate offspring of the agency of the Spirit. And a habitual silence is as much the consequence, as if the persons present had been at a place of worship.

It may be observed, however, that such pauses seldom or never occur in ordinary companies, or where members ordinarily visit one another. When they take place, it is mostly when a minister is present, and when such a minister is upon a religious visit to the families of a certain district. In such a case, such religious pauses and exhortations are not unfrequent. A man, however, may be a hundred times in the company of the Quakers, and never be present at one of them, and never know indeed that they exist at all.

CHAPTER VI.

Custom before meals—Ancients formerly made an oblation to Vesta before their meals—Christians have substituted grace—Quakers agree with others in the necessity of grace, or thankfulness, but dare not adopt it as a devotional act, unless it come from the heart—allow a silent pause for religious impressions on these occasions—Observations on a Scotch grace.

There was a time in the early ages of Greece, when men, apparently little better than beasts of prey, could not meet at entertainments without quarrelling about the victuals before them. The memory of this circumstance is well preserved in the expressions of early writers. In process of time, however, regulations began to be introduced, and quarrels to be prevented, by the institution of the

office of a divider or distributer of the feast, who should carve the food into equal portions, and help every individual to his proper share. Hence the terms Δαὶς εἴση, or Equal Feast, which so frequently occur in Homer, and which were in use in consequence of the division just mentioned, were made use of, to show that the feasts then spoken of by him were different from those of former times. When Homer wishes to describe persons as more civilized than others, he describes them as having this equal feast; that is, men did not appear at these feasts, like dogs and wolves, and instantly devour whatever they could come at, and in the end tear each other to pieces; but they waited till their different portions of meat had been assigned them, and then ate them in amity and love.

At the time when we find the custom of one man carving for all his guests to have been in use, we find also that another had been introduced among the same people. The Greeks, in the heroic ages, thought it unlawful to eat, till they had first offered a part of their provision to the gods. Hence, oblations to Vesta, and afterwards to others, whom their superstition had defied, came into general use, so that these were always made before the victuals on the table were allowed to be tasted by any of the guests.

These two customs since that time have come regularly down to the present day. Every person helps his family and his friends at his own table. But as Christians can make no sacrifices to Heathen deities, we usually find them substituting thanksgiving for oblation, and giving to the Creator of the universe, instead of an offering of the first fruits from their table, an offering of gratitude from their hearts. This oblation, which is now usually denominated Grace, consists of a form of words, which, being expressive either of praise or thankfulness to God for the blessings of food, with which he continues to supply them, is repeated by the master of the family, or by a minister of the gospel, if present, before any one partakes of the victuals that are set before him. These forms, however, differ as used by Christians. They differ in length, in ideas, in expression. One Christian uses one form, another uses another. It may, however, be observed, that the same Christian generally uses the same form of words, or the same grace, on the same occasion.

The Quakers, as a religious body, agree in the propriety of grace before their meals; that is, in the propriety of giving thanks to the Author of every good gift for this particular bounty of his providence, as to the articles of their daily subsistence; but they differ as to the manner and seasonableness of it on such occasions. They think that people, who are in the habit of repeating a determined form of words, may cease to feel, as they pronounce them; in

which case the grace becomes an oblation from the tongue, but not from the heart. They think, also, that, if grace is to be repeated regularly, just as the victuals come, or as regularly and as often as they come upon the table, it may be repeated unseasonably, that is, unseasonable with the state of the heart of him, who is to pronounce it; that the heart of man is not to-day as it was yesterday, nor at this hour what it was at a former, nor on any given hour alike disposed; and that if this grace is to be said when the heart is gay or light, or volatile, it ceases to be a devotional act, and becomes at least a superfluous and unmeaning, if not a censurable, form.

The Quakers, then, to avoid the unprofitableness of such artificial graces on the one hand, and, on the other, to give an opportunity to the heart to accord with the tongue, whenever it is used in praise of the Creator, observe the following custom. When they are all seated at table, they sit in solemn silence, and in a thoughtful position, for some time. If the master of the family, during this silence, should feel any religious impression on his mind, whether of praise or thankfulness, on the occasion, he gives utterance to his feelings. Such praise or thanksgiving in him is considered as a devotional act, and as the Quaker-grace. But if, after having waited in silence for some time, he feel no such religious disposition, he utters no religious expression. The Quakers hold it better to say no grace, than to say that, which is not accompanied by the devotion of the heart. In this case he resumes his natural position, breaks the silence by means of natural discourse, and begins to carve for his family or his friends.

This is the ordinary way of proceeding in Quaker-families, when alone, or in ordinary company. But if a minister happen to be at the table, the master of the family, conceiving such a man to be more in the habit of religious impressions than himself, or any ordinary person, looks up, as it were, to him, as to a channel from whence it is possible that such religious exercise may come. If the minister, during the solemn, silent pause, be impressed, he gives utterance as before: if not, he relieves himself from his grave and thoughtful position, and breaks the silence of the company by engaging in natural discourse. After this, the company proceed to their meals.

If I were to be asked whether the graces of the Quakers were frequent I should reply in the negative. I never heard any delivered but when a minister was present. The ordinary grace, therefore, of private families consists in a solemn, silent pause, between the time of sitting down to the table and the time of carving the victuals, during which an opportunity is given for the excitement of religious feelings. A person may dine fifty times at the tables of the Quakers,

and see no other substitution for grace than this temporary, silent pause. Indeed no other grace than this can be consistent with their principles. It was coeval with the institution of the Society, and must continue while it lasts. For thanksgiving is an act of devotion. Now no act, in the opinion of the Quakers, can be devotional or spiritual, except it originate from above. Men, in religious matters, can do nothing of themselves, or without the Divine aid. And they must therefore wait in silence for this spiritual help, as well in the case of grace, as in the case of any other kind of devotion, if they mean their praise or thanksgiving on these occasions to be an act of religion.

There is in the Quaker-grace, and its accompaniments, whenever it is uttered, an apparent beauty and an apparent solemnity, which are seldom conspicuous in those of others. How few are there who repeat the common artificial graces feelingly, and with minds intent upon the subject! Grace is usually said as a mere ceremony or custom. The Supreme Being is just thanked in so many words, while the thoughts are often rambling to other subjects. The Quaker-grace, on the other hand, whenever it is uttered, does not come out in any mechanical form of words, which men have used before, but in expressions adapted to the feelings. It comes forth, also, warm from the heart. It comes after a solemn, silent pause; and it becomes, therefore, under all these circumstances, an act of real solemnity and genuine devotion.

It is astonishing how little even men of acknowledged piety seem to have their minds fixed upon the ideas contained in the mechanical graces, which they repeat. I was one afternoon at a friend's house, where there happened to be a clergyman of the Scottish church. He was a man deservedly esteemed for his piety. The company was large. Politics had been discussed some time, when the tea-things were introduced. While the bread and butter were bringing in, the clergyman, who had taken an active part in the discussion, put a question to a gentleman, who was sitting in a corner of the room. The gentleman began to reply, and was proceeding in his answer, when of a sudden I heard a solemn voice. Being surprised, I looked around, and found it was the clergyman, who had suddenly started up, and was saying grace. The solemnity, with which he spoke, occasioned his voice to differ so much from its ordinary tone, that I did not, till I had looked about me, discover who the speaker was. I think he might be engaged from three to four minutes in the delivery of this grace. I could not help thinking, during the delivery of it, that I never knew any person say grace like this man: nor was I ever so much moved with any grace, or thought I ever

saw so clearly the propriety of saying grace, as on this occasion. But when I found that on the very instant the grace was over, politics were resumed; when I found that no sooner had the last word in the grace been pronounced, than the next, which came from the clergyman himself, began by desiring the gentleman before mentioned to go on with his reply to his own political question; I was so struck with the inconsistency of the thing, that the beauty and solemnity of his grace all vanished. This sudden transition from politics to grace, and from grace to politics, afforded a proof that artificial sentences might be so frequently repeated, as to fail to re-excite their first impressions; or that certain expressions, which might have constituted devotional acts under devotional feeling, might relapse into heartless forms.

I would not wish, by the relation of this anecdote, to be understood as reflecting in the slightest manner on the practice of the Scottish church: I know well the general sobriety, diligence, piety, and religious example of its ministers. I mentioned it merely to show, that even where the religious character of a person was high, his mind, by the frequent repetitions of the same forms of expression on the same occasions, might frequently lose sight of the meaning and force of the words as they were uttered, so that he might pronounce them without that spiritual feeling, which can alone constitute a religious exercise.

CHAPTER VII.

Customs at and after meals—Quakers never drink healths at dinner, nor toasts after dinner—the drinking of toasts a Heathen custom—interrupts often the innocence, and leads to the intoxication, of the company—Anecdote of Judge Hale—Quakers sometimes in embarrassing situations on account of this omission—Quaker-women seldom retire after dinner, and leave the men drinking—Quakers a sober people.

The members of this Society, though they are occasionally found in the custom of saying grace, do not, as I have stated, either use it as regularly, or in the same manner, as other Christians.

Neither do they at their meals, or after their meals, use the same ceremonies as others. They have exploded the unmeaning and troublesome custom of drinking healths at their dinners.

This custom they have rejected upon the principle, that it has no connection with true civility. They consider it as officious, trouble-

some, and even embarrassing, on some occasions. To drink to a man, when he is lifting his victuals to his mouth, and by calling off his attention to make him drop them, or to interrupt two people who are eating and talking together, and to break the thread of their discourse, seems to be an action as rude in its principle as disagreeable in its effect. Nor is the custom often less troublesome to the person drinking the health, than to the person whose health is drunk. If a man finds two people engaged in conversation, he must wait till he catches their eyes before he can drink himself. A man may also often be put into a delicate and difficult situation to know whom to drink to first, and whom second; and may be troubled, lest, by drinking improperly to one before another, he may either be reputed awkward, or may become the occasion of offence. They consider, also, the custom of drinking healths at dinner as unnecessary, and as tending to no useful end. It must be obvious, that a man may wish another his health full as much without drinking it, as by drinking it with his glass in his hand. And it must be equally obvious, that wishes, expressed in this manner, can have no medicinal effect.

With respect to the custom of drinking healths at dinner, I may observe, that the innovation, which the Quakers seem to have been the first to have made upon the practice of it, has been adopted by many, not out of compliance with their example, but on account of the trouble and inconveniences attending it; that the custom is not now so general as it was; that in the higher and more fashionable circles it has nearly been exploded; and that among some of the other classes of society it is gradually declining.

With respect to the custom of drinking toasts after dinner, the Quakers have rejected it for various reasons.

They have rejected it, first, because, however desirable it may be that Christians should follow the best customs of the Heathens, it would be a reproach to them to follow their worst: or, in other words, it would be improper for men, whose religion required spirituality of thought and feeling, to imitate the Heathens in the manner of their enjoyment of sensual pleasures. The laws and customs of drinking, the Quakers observe, are all of Heathen origin. The similitude between these and those of modern times is too remarkable to be overlooked; and too striking not to warrant them in concluding, that Christians have taken their model on this subject from Pagan practice.

In every Grecian family, where company was invited, the master of it was considered to be the king or president of the feast in his own house. He was usually denominated the Eye of the company.

It was one of his offices to look about and see that his guests drank their proper portions of the wine. It was another, to keep peace and harmony among them. For these purposes his word was law. At entertainments at the public expense the same office existed; but the person them appointed to it was nominated either by lot, or by the votes of the persons present. This custom obtains among the moderns. The master of every family at the present day presides at his own table for the same purposes. And at great and public dinners at taverns a similar officer is appointed, who is generally chosen by the committee, who first meet for the proposal of the feast.

One of the first toasts that were usually drunk among the ancient Greeks, was to the "Gods." This entirely corresponds with the modern idea of Church; and if the Government had been only coupled with the Gods in these ancient times, it would have precisely answered to the modern toast of "Church and State."

It was also usual at the entertainments, given by Grecian families, to drink to the prosperity of those persons, for whom they entertained a friendship, but who happened to be absent. No toast can better coincide than this, with that, which is so frequently given, of "Our absent friends."

It was also a Grecian practice for each of the guests to name his particular friend; and sometimes, also, his particular mistress. The moderns have also a parallel for this: every person gives (to use the common phrase) his Gentleman, and also his Lady, in his turn.

It is well known to have been the usage of the ancient Greeks, at their entertainments, either to fill, or to have had their cups filled for them, to the brim. The moderns do precisely the same thing. Glasses so filled have the particular name of Bumpers: and however vigilantly an ancient Greek might have looked after his guests, and made them drink their glasses filled in this manner, the presidents of modern times are equally vigilant in enforcing an adherence to the same custom.

It was an ancient practice, also, with the same people, to drink three glasses when the Graces, and nine when the Muses, were named; and three, and three times three, were drunk on particular occasions. This barbarous practice has fortunately not come down to the moderns to its full extent; but they have retained the remembrance of it, and celebrated it in part, by following up their toast, on any extraordinary occasion, not with three or nine glasses of wine, but with three or nine cheers.

Among the ancients before mentioned, if any of the persons present were found deficient in drinking their proper portions, they were ordered by the president either to drink them, or to leave the room.

This usage has been a little altered by the moderns. They do not order those persons to leave the company, who do not comply with the same rules of drinking as the rest, but they subject them to be fined, as it is termed; that is, they oblige them to drink double portions for their deficiency, or they punish them in some other manner.

From hence it will be obvious that the laws of drinking are of Heathen origin; that is, the custom of drinking toasts originated as the Quakers contend, with men of heathen minds and affections, for a sensual purpose; and it is therefore a custom, they believe, which men of Christian minds and affections should never follow.

The Quakers have rejected the custom, again, because they consider it to be inconsistent with their Christian character in other respects. They consider it as morally injurious: for toasts frequently excite and promote indelicate ideas, and thus sometimes interrupt the innocence of conversation.

They consider it as morally injurious, again because the drinking of toasts has a direct tendency to promote drunkenness.

They, who have been much in company, must have had repeated opportunities of witnessing that this idea of the Quakers is founded in truth. Men are undoubtedly stimulated to drink more than they like, and to become intoxicated, in consequence of the use of toasts. If a man has no objection to drink toasts at all, he must drink that which the master of the house proposes; and it is usual in this case to fill a bumper. Respect to his host is considered as demanding this. Thus one full glass is secured to him at the outset. He must also drink a bumper to the King, another to Church and State, and another to the Army and Navy. He would in many companies be thought hostile to the Government, if, in the habit of drinking toasts, he were to refuse to drink these, or to honor them in the same manner. Thus three additional glasses are entailed upon him. He must also drink a bumper to his own toast. He would be thought to dishonor the person, whose health he had given, if he were to fail in this. Thus a fifth glass is added to his share. He must fill a little, besides, to every other toast, or he is considered as deficient in respect to the person, who has proposed it. Thus many additional glasses are forced upon him. By this time the wine begins to act, when new toasts, of a new nature, assail his ear, and he is stimulated to new potions. There are many toasts of so patriotic, and others of so generous and convivial a nature, that a man is looked upon as disaffected, or devoid of sentiment, who refuses them. Add to this, that there is a sort of shame, which the young and generous in particular feel in being outdone, and in not keeping pace with the rest, on such occasions. Thus toast being urged after toast, and shame

acting upon shame, a variety of causes conspires at the same moment to drive him on till the liquor at length overcomes him, and he falls eventually a victim to its power.

It will be manifest from this account, that the laws of drinking, by which the necessity of drinking a certain number of toasts is enjoined,—by which bumpers are attached to certain classes of toasts, —by which a stigma is affixed to a non-compliance with the terms,— by which, in fact, a regular system of etiquette is established,—cannot but lead, except a man is uncommonly resolute or particularly on his guard, to intoxication. We see, indeed, instances of men drinking glass after glass, because stimulated in this manner, even against their own inclination, nay even against the determination they had made before they went into company, till they have made themselves quite drunk. But had there been no laws of drinking, or no toasts, we cannot see any reason, why the same persons should not have returned sober to their respective homes.

It is recorded of the great Sir Matthew Hale, who is deservedly placed among the great men of our country, that, in his early youth, he had been in company, where the party had drunk to such excess, that one of them fell down apparently dead. Quitting the room, he implored forgiveness of the Almighty for this excessive intemperance in himself and his companions, and made a vow, that he would never drink another health while he lived. This vow he kept to his dying day. It is hardly necessary for me to remark, that he would never have come to such a resolution, if he had not believed either that the drinking of toasts had produced the excesses of that day, or that the custom led so naturally to intoxication, that it became his duty to avoid it.

The Quakers, having rejected the use of toasts upon the principles assigned, are sometimes placed in a difficult situation, in which there is an occasion for the trial of their courage, in consequence of mixing with others, by whom the custom is still followed.

In companies, to which they are invited in regular families, they are seldom put to any disagreeable dilemma in this respect. The master of the house, if in the habit of giving toasts, generally knowing the custom of the Society in this instance, passes over any member of it, who may be present, and calls upon his next neighbor for a toast. Good-breeding and hospitality demand that such indulgence and exception should be given.

There are situations, however, in which their courage is often tried. One of the worst, in which a Quaker can be placed, and in which he is frequently placed, is that of being at a common room in an inn, where a number of other travellers dine and

sup together. In such companies, things are seldom conducted so much to his satisfaction in this respect as in those described. In general, as the bottle passes, some jocose hint is conveyed to him about the toast; and though this is perhaps done with good humor, his feelings are wounded by it. At other times, when the company are of a less liberal complexion, there is a determination, soon understood among one another, to hunt him down, as if he were fair game. A toast is pressed upon him, though all know that it is not his custom to drink it. On refusing, they begin to tease him. One jokes with him: another banters him. Toasts, both illiberal and indelicate, are at length introduced: and he has no alternative but that of bearing the banter, or of quitting the room. I have seen a Quaker in such a company (and at such a distance from home that the transaction in all probability never could have been known, had he, in order to free himself from their attacks, conformed to their custom) bear all their raillery with astonishing firmness, and courageously struggle against the stream. It is certainly an awkward thing for a solitary Quaker to fall into such companies; and it requires considerable courage to preserve singularity in the midst of the prejudices of ignorant or illiberal men.

This custom, however, of drinking toasts after dinner, is, like the former of drinking healths at dinner, happily declining. It is much to the credit of those, who move in the higher circles, that they have generally exploded both. It may be owing to this circumstance, that though we find persons of this description laboring under the imputation of levity and dissipation, we yet find them respectable for the sobriety of their lives. Drunkenness, indeed, forms no part of their character; nor, generally speaking, is it a vice of the present age as it was of former ages: and there seems to be little doubt that, in proportion as the custom of drinking healths and toasts, but more particularly the latter, is suppressed, this vice will become less and less a trait in the national character.

There are one or two other customs of the Quakers, which I shall notice before I conclude this chapter.

It is one of the fashions of the world, where people meet in company, for men and women, when the dinner is over, to drink their wine together, and for the women, having done this for a short time to retire. This custom of the females withdrawing after dinner was probably first insisted upon, from an idea, that their presence would be a restraint upon the circulation of the bottle, as well as upon the conversation of the men. The members however, of this Society seldom submit to this practice. Men and women generally sit

together and converse as before dinner. I do not mean by this, that women may not retire if they please, because there is no restraint upon any one in the company of the Quakers: nor do I mean to say that women do not occasionally retire, and leave the men at their wine. There are a few rich families, which, having mixed more than usually with the world, allow of this separation. But where one allows it, there are ninety-nine, who give wine to their company after dinner, who do not. It is not a Quaker custom, that, in a given time after dinner, the one should be separated from the other sex.

It is a pity that the practice of the Quakers should not have been adopted by others of our own country in this particular. Many advantages would result to those, who were to follow the example. For, if women were allowed to remain, chastity of expression and decorum of behavior would be more likely to be insured. Their presence, also, would operate as a check upon drunkenness. Nor can there be a doubt that women would enliven and give a variety to conversation; and, as they have had a different education from men, that an opportunity of mutual improvement might be afforded by the continance of the two in the society of one another.

It is also usual with the world in such companies, that the men, when the females have retired, should continue drinking till tea-time. This custom is unknown to the Quakers, even to those few, who allow of a separation of the sexes. It is not unusual with them to propose a walk before tea, if the weather permits. But even in the case where they remain at the table, their time is spent rather in conversing than in drinking. They have no toasts, as I have observed, which should induce them put the bottle round in a given time, or which should oblige them to take a certain number of glasses. The bottle, however, is usually put round, and each helps himself as he pleases. At length one of the guests, having had sufficient, declines filling his glass. Another in a little time declines also for the same cause. A third, after having taken what he thinks sufficient, follows the example. The wine is soon afterwards taken away, and this mostly long before the hour of drinking tea. Neither drunkenness, nor any situation approaching to drunkenness, is known in the Quaker-companies. Excess in drinking is strictly forbidden by the laws of the Society. It is a subject of one of their Queries. It is of course a subject, that is often brought to their recollection. Whatever may be the faults of the Quakers, they must be acknowledged to be a sober people.

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION I.

Marriage—Quakers differ in many respects from others on the subject of marriage George Fox introduced regulations concerning it—protested against the usual manner of the celebration of it—gave an example of what he recommended—present regulations of the Society on this subject.

In the continuation of the Customs of the Quakers, a subject which I purpose to resume in the present volume, I shall begin with that of Marriage.

The members of this Society differ from others in many of their regulations concerning this custom. They differ also in the manner of the celebration of it. And as they differ in these respects, so they experience generally a different result. As a married, they may be said to be, a happy people. Hence the detailers of scandal have rarely had it in their power to promulgate a Quaker-adultery. Nor have the lawyers had an opportunity, in our public courts, to proclaim a Quaker-divorce.

George Fox suggested many regulations on this subject. He advised, among other things, when persons had it in contemplation to marry, that they should lay their intentions before the monthly meetings both of the men and the women. He advised also, that the consent of their parents should be previously obtained and certified to these. Thus he laid the foundation for greater harmony in the approaching union. He advised, again, that an inquiry should be made, whether the parties were clear of engagements or promises of marriage to others; and, if they were not, that they should be hindered from proceeding. Thus he cut off some of the causes of the interruption of connubial happiness, by preventing uneasy reflections, or suits at law, after the union had taken place. He advised also, in the case of second marriages, that any offspring resulting from the former should have their due rights and a proper provision secured to them, before they were allowed to be solemnized. Thus he gave a greater chance for happiness, by preventing mercenary motives from becoming the causes of the union of husband and wife.

But George Fox, as he introduced these and other salutary regulations on the subject of marriage, so he introduced a new manner of the solemnization of it. He protested against the manner of the world; that is, against the formal prayers and exhortations as they were repeated, and against the formal ceremonies as they were prac-

tised, by the parish priest. He considered that it was God, who joined man and woman before the Fall, and that in Christian times, or where the man was truly renovated in heart, there could be no other right or honorable way of union. Consistently with this view of the subject, he observed, that in the ancient scriptural times persons took each other in marriage in the assemblies of the elders, and that there was no record, from the book of Genesis to that of Revelations, of any marriage by a priest. Hence it became his new Society, as a religious or renovated people, to abandon apostate usages, and to adopt a manner that was more agreeable to their new state.

George Fox gave in his own marriage an example of all that he had thus recommended to the society. Having agreed with Margaret Fell, the widow of Judge Fell, upon the propriety of their union as husband and wife, "he desired her to send for her children. As soon as they were come, he asked them and their respective husbands*, if they had any thing against it or for it, desiring them to speak. And they all severally expressed their satisfaction therein. Then he asked Margaret, if she had fulfilled and performed her husband's will. She replied, the children knew that. Whereupon he asked them, whether, if their mother married, they should not lose by it. And he asked Margaret, whether she had done any thing in lieu of it, which might answer it to the children. The children said, she had answered it to them, and desired him to speak no more about that. He told them that he was plain, and that he would have all things done plainly, for he sought not any outward advantage to himself. So, after he had acquainted the children with it, their intention of marriage was laid before friends, both privately and publicly;" and afterwards, a meeting being appointed for the accomplishment of the marriage, in the public meeting-house at Broad Mead in Bristol, they took each other in marriage, in the plain and simple manner as then practiced, and which he himself had originally recommended to his followers.

The regulations concerning marriage, and the manner of the solemnization of it, which obtained in the time of George Fox, nearly obtain among the Quakers at the present day.

When marriage is agreed upon between two persons, the man and the woman, at one of the monthly meetings, publicly declare their intention concerning it. At this time, their parents, if living, must either appear, or send certificates, to signify their consent. This being done, two men are appointed by the men's meeting, and two

* G. Fox's Journal, vol. ii. 135.

women by that of the women, to wait upon the man and woman respectively, and to learn from themselves, as well as by other inquiry, if they stand perfectly clear from any marriage-promises and engagements to others. At the next monthly meeting, the deputation make their report. If either of the parties is reported to have given expectation of marriage to any other individual, the proceedings are stopped till the matter be satisfactorily explained. But if they are both of them reported to be clear in this respect, they are at liberty to proceed, and one or more persons of respectability, of each sex, are deputed to see that the marriage be orderly conducted.

In the case of second marriages, additional instructions are sometimes given; for if any of the parties, thus intimating their intention of marrying, should have children alive, the same persons, who were deputed to inquire into their clearness from all other engagements, are to see that the rights of such children be legally secured.

When the parties are considered to be free, by the reports of the deputation, to proceed upon their union, they appoint a suitable day for the solemnization of it, which is generally one of the week-day meetings for worship. On this day, they repair to the meeting-house with their friends. The congregation, when seated, sit in silence. Perhaps some minister is induced to speak. After a suitable time has elapsed, the man and the woman rise up together, and, taking each other by the hand, declare publicly that they thus take each other as husband and wife. This constitutes their marriage. A writing is then generally produced and read, though this be not necessary, stating concisely the proceedings of the parties in their respective meetings, for the purpose of their marriage, and the declaration just made by them as having taken each other as husband and wife. This is signed by the parties, their relatives, and frequently by many of their friends and others present. By way, however, of necessary evidence of their union, another paper is signed in the course of the day, and generally after dinner, by the man and woman in the presence of three witnesses, who sign it also, in which it is stated that they have so taken each other in marriage. All marriages of other dissenters are celebrated in the established churches, according to the ceremonies of the same. But the marriages of the members of this Society are valid by law in their own meeting-houses, when solemnized in this simple manner.

SECTION II.

Quakers marrying out of the Society to be disowned—This regulation charged with pride and cruelty—Reasons for this disownment are—that mixed marriages cannot be celebrated without a violation of some of the great principles of the Society—that they are generally productive of disputes and uneasiness to those concerned—and that the discipline cannot be carried on in such families.

Among the regulations suggested by George Fox, and adopted by his followers, it was determined that persons belonging to the Society should not intermarry with those of other religious professions. Such a heterogeneous union was denominated a mixed marriage; and persons engaged in such mixed marriages were to be disowned.

People of other religious denominations have charged the Quakers with a very censurable pride, on account of their adoption of this law. They consider them as looking down upon the rest of their fellow-creatures, as so inferior, or unholy, as not to deign or to dare to mix in alliance with them, or as looking upon them in the same light as the Jews considered the Heathen, or the Greeks the Barbarian world. And they have charged them also with as much cruelty as pride on the same account. "A Quaker," they say, "feels himself strongly attached to an accomplished woman. But she does not belong to the Society. He wishes to marry, but he cannot marry her on account of its laws. Having a respect for the Society, he looks round it again, but he looks round it in vain. He finds no one, whom he thinks equal to this woman; no one, whom he could love so well. To marry one in the Society, while he loves another out of it better, would be evidently wrong. If he does not marry her, he makes the greatest of all sacrifices; for he loses that which he supposes would constitute a source of enjoyment to him for the remainder of his life. If he marries her, he is expelled from the Society, and this without having been guilty of an immoral offence."

One of the reasons, which the Quakers give for the adoption of this law of disownment in the case of mixed marriages, is, that they who engage in them, violate some of the most important principles of the Society, and such indeed as are distinguishing characteristics of Quakerism from the religion of the world.

It is a religious tenet of the Society, as will be shown in its proper place, that no appointment of man can make a minister of the gospel; and that no service, consisting of an artificial form of words, to be pronounced on stated occasions, can constitute a religious act; for that the spirit of God is essentially necessary to create the one, and to produce the other. It is also another tenet, that no minister

of a Christian church ought to be paid for his gospel labors. This latter tenet is held so sacred by the Quakers, that it affords one reason among others, why they refuse payment of tithes and other demands of the church, choosing rather to suffer loss by distraints for them, than to comply with them in the usual manner. Now these two principles are essentials of Quakerism. But no person, who marries out of the Society, can be legally married without going through the forms of the established church. Those, therefore, who submit to this ceremony, as performed by a priest, acknowledge, according to the Quakers, the validity of a human appointment of the ministry. They acknowledge the validity of an artificial service in religion. They acknowledge the propriety of paying a gospel minister for the discharge of his office. The Quakers, therefore, consider those, who marry out of the Society, as guilty of such dereliction of their pinciples, that they can no longer be considered as sound or consistent members.

But, independently of the violation of these principles, which they take as the strongest ground for their conduct on such an occasion, they think themselves warranted in disowning, from a contemplation of the consequences, which have been known to result from these marriages.

In the first place, disownment is held to be necessary, because it acts as a check upon such marriages, and because, by acting as such a check, it prevents the family-disputes and disagreements, which might otherwise arise; for such marriages have been often found to be more productive of uneasiness than enjoyment. When two persons of different religious principles, a Quaker for example, and a woman of the church, join in marriage, it is almost impossible that they should not occasionally differ. The subject of religion arises, and perhaps some little altercation with it, as the Sunday comes. The one will not go to church, and the other will not go to meeting. These disputes do not always die with time. They arise, however, more or less, according to circumstances. If neither of the parties sets any value upon his or her religious opinions, there will be but little occasion for dispute. If both of them, on the other hand, are of a serious cast, much will depend on the liberality of their sentiments: but, generally speaking, it falls to the lot of but few to be free from religious prejudices. And here it may be observed, that points in religion also may occasionally be suggested, which may bring with them the seeds of temporary uneasiness. People of other religious denominations generally approach nearer to one another, in their respective creeds, than the members of this Society to either of them. Most Christians agree, for example, in the use of

Baptism in some form or other, and also in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. But the Quakers, as will be shown in this volume, consider these ordinances in a spiritual light, admitting no ceremonials in so pure a system as that of the Christian religion.

But differences, which may thus, soon or late, take their rise upon these or other subjects, where the parties set a value on their respective religious opinions, cannot fail of being augmented in time by new circumstances. The parties in question have children. The education of these is now a subject of the most important concern. New disputes are engendered on this head, both adhering to their respective tenets, as the best to be embraced by their rising offspring. Unable at length to agree on this point, a sort of compromise takes place. The boys are denied, while the girls are permitted, baptism. The boys, again, are brought up to meeting, and the girls to church, or they go to church and meeting alternately. In the latter case, none of the children can have any fixed principles. Nor will they be much better off in the former. There will be frequently an opposition of each other's religious opinions, and a constant hesitation and doubt about the consistency of these. There are many points, which the mother will teach the daughters as right or essential, but which the father will teach the sons as erroneous or unimportant. Thus disputes will be conveyed to the children. In their progress through life other circumstances may arise, which may give birth to feelings of an unpleasant nature. The daughters will probably be instructed in the accomplishments of the world. They will also be introduced to the card-room, and to assemblies, and to the theatre in their turn. The boys will be admitted to neither. The latter will of course feel their pleasures abridged, and consider their case as hard, and their father as morose and cruel. Little jealousies may arise upon this difference of their treatment, which may be subversive of filial and fraternal affection. Nor can religion be called in to correct them; for, while the two opposite examples of father and mother, and of sisters and brothers, are held out to be right, there will be considerable doubts as to what are religious truths.

They urge again in behalf of their law against mixed marriages, that, if these were not forbidden, it would be impossible to carry on the discipline of the Society. The truth of this may be judged of by the preceding remarks. For, if the family were divided into two parties, as has been just stated, on account of their religion, it would be but in a kind of mongrel state. If, for instance, it were thought right that the Quaker-part of it should preserve the simplicity of the Quaker-dress, and the plainness of the Quaker-language, how is this to be done, while the other part daily move in the fashions, and are

taught, as a right usage, to persist in the phrases, of the world? If, again, the Quaker-part of it are to be kept from the amusements prohibited by the Society, how is this to be effected, while the other part speak of them, from their own experience, with rapture or delight? It would be impossible, therefore, in the opinion of the Quakers, in so mixed a family, to keep up that discipline, which they consider as a corner-stone of their constitutional fabric, and which may be said to have been an instrument, in obtaining for them the character of a moral people.

SECTION III.

But though persons are thus disowned, they may be restored to membership—Generally understood, however, that they must previously express their repentance for their marriages—This confession of repentance censured by the world—but is admissible without the criminality supposed—The word repentance misunderstood by the world.

But though the Quakers may disown such as marry out of their Society, it does not follow that these may not be reinstated as members. If these should conduct themselves, after their disownment, in an orderly manner; and, still retaining their attachment to the Society, should bring up their children in the principles and customs of it; they may, if they apply for restoration, obtain it, with all their former privileges and rights.

The children also of such as marry out of the Society, though they are never considered to be members of it, may yet become so in particular cases. The Society advise that the monthly meetings should extend a tender care toward such children, and that they should be admitted into membership, at the discretion of the said meeting, either in infancy or in maturer age.

But here I must stop to make a few observations on an opinion, which prevails on this subject. It is generally understood that the Quakers, in their restoration of disowned persons to membership, require them previously and publicly to acknowledge that they have repented of their marriages. This obligation, to make this public confession of repentance, has given many a handle for heavy charges against them. Indeed, I scarcely know, in any part of the Quaker-system, where people are louder in their censures than upon this point. "A man, they say, cannot express his penitence for his marriage, without throwing a stigma upon his wife. To do this is morally wrong, if he has no fault to find with her. To do it, even if she has been in fault, is indelicate. And not to do it is to forego his restoration to membership. This law, therefore of the Quakers is considered to be immoral, because it may lead both to hypocrisy and falsehood."

I shall not take up time in correcting the notions that have gone abroad upon this subject.

Of those who marry out of the society, it may be presumed that there are some, who were never considered to be sound in the Quaker-principles; and these are mostly they, who intermarry with the world. Now these, who compose this class, generally live after their marriages as happily out of the Society as when they were in it. Of course these do not repent of the change. And if they do not repent, they never sue for restoration to membership. They cannot therefore incur any of the charges in question. Nor can the Society be blamed in this case, who, by never asking them to become members, never entice them to any objectionable repentance.

Of those, again, who marry out of the Society, there may be individuals so attached to its communion, that it was never imagined they would have acted in this manner. Now of these it may in general be said, that they often bitterly repent. They find, soon or late, that the opposite opinions and manners to be found in their union do not harmonize, and therefore they experience a disappointment, which they did not expect.

I have no doubt that instances might be produced, not included in either of the cases now mentioned, by which it would appear, that persons of this Society might say that they repented, and this truly, without any crimination of their wives; but the production of these is unnecessary, because they, who make the charge in question, have entirely misapplied the meaning of the word "repent." People are not called upon on this occasion to express their sorrow for having married the objects of their choice, but for having violated those great tenets of the Society, which have already been mentioned, and which form distinguishing characteristics between Quakerism and the religion of the world. They, therefore, who say that they repent, say no more than what any other persons might be presumed to say, who had violated the religious tenets of any other society to which they might have belonged, or who had flown in the face of what they had imagined to be religious truths.

SECTION IV.

Of persons, disowned for marriage, the greater proportion is said to consist of women—Causes assigned for this difference of number-in the two sexes.

It will perhaps appear a curious fact to the world, but I am told it is true, that the number of women, who are disowned for marrying out of the Society, far exceeds the number of the men, who are disowned on the same account.

It is not difficult, if the fact be as it is stated, to assign a reason for this difference of number in the two sexes.

When men wish to marry, they wish, at least if they are men of sense, to find such women as are virtuous; to find such as are prudent and domestic; such as have a proper sense of the folly and dissipation of the world; such, in fact, as will make good mothers and good wives. Now, if a Quaker looks into his own Society, he will generally find the female part of it of this description. Female Quakers excel in these points. But if he looks into the world at large, he will generally find a contrast in the females there. These in general are but badly educated. They are taught to place a portion of their happiness in finery and show. Utility is abandoned for fashion. The knowledge of the etiquette of the drawing-room usurps the place of the knowledge of the domestic duties. A kind of false and dangerous taste predominates. Scandal and the card-table are preferred to the pleasures of a rural walk. Virtue and modesty are to be seen with only half their energies, being overpowered by the noxiousness of novel-reading principles, and by the moral taint which infects those, who engage in the varied rounds of of a fashionable life. Hence a want of knowledge, a love of trifles, and a dissipated turn of mind, generally characterize those, who are considered as having had the education of the world.

We see, therefore, a good reason why the men should confine themselves in their marriages to their own Society. But the same reason, which thus operates with Quaker-men in the choice of Quaker women, operates occasionally with men, who are not of the Society, in choosing them also for their wives. These are often no strangers to the good education and the high character of the Quaker females. Fearful often of marrying among the badly educated women of their own persuasion, they address themselves to those of the Society, and not unfrequently succeed.

To this it may be added, that if the men were to attempt to marry out of their own Society, they would not in general be well received. Their dress and their manners are considered as uncouth in the eyes of the female world, and would present themselves as so many obstacles in the way of their success. The women of this description generally like a smart and showy exterior. They admire heroism and spirit. But neither such an exterior nor such spirit is to be seen in the Quaker-men. The dress of the Quaker-females, on the other hand, is considered as neat and elegant, and their modesty and demeanor as worthy of admiration. From these circumstances they captivate. Hence the difference, both in the inward and outward

person, between the men and the women of this Society, renders the former not so pleasing, while it renders the latter objects of admiration and even of choice.

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION I.

Funerals—Most nations have paid extravagant attention to their dead—The moderns follow their example—This extravagance, or the pageantry of funerals, discarded by the Quakers—Their reasons for it—Plainness of Quaker-funerals.

If we look into the history of the world, we shall find, from whatever cause it has arisen, whether from any thing connected with our moral feelings, such as love, gratitude, or respect, or from vanity and ostentation, that almost all nations, where individuals have been able to afford it, have incurred considerable expense in the interment of their dead. The Greeks were often very extravagant in their funerals. Many persons ornamented with garlands followed the corpse, while others were employed in singing and dancing before it. At the funerals of the great, among the Romans, couches were carried containing the waxen or other images of the family of the deceased, and hundreds joined in the procession. In our own times, we find a difference in the manner of furnishing or decorating funerals, though but little in the intention of making them objects of outward show. A bearer of plumes precedes the procession. The horses employed are dressed in trappings. The hearse follows, ornamented with plumes of feathers, and gilded and silvered with gaudy escutcheons, or the armorial bearings of the progenitors of the deceased. A group of hired persons range themselves on each side of the hearse and attendant carriages, while others close the procession. These, again, are all of them clad in long cloaks, or furnished in regular order with scarfs and hatbands. Now all these outward appendages, which may be called the pageantry of funerals; the Quakers have discarded, from the time of their institution, in the practice of the burial of their dead.

The Quakers are of opinion that funeral-processions should be made, if any thing is to be made of them, to excite serious reflections, and to produce lessons of morality, in those who see them. This they conceive to be best done by depriving the dead body of all ornaments and outward honors. For, stripped in this manner, they

conceive it to approach the nearest to its native worthlessness or dust. Such funerals, therefore, may excite in the spectator a deep sense of the low and debased condition of man. And his feelings will be pure on the occasion, because they will be unmixed with the consideration of the artificial distinctions of human life. The spectator too will be more likely, if he sees all go undistinguished to the grave, to deduce for himself the moral lesson, that there is no true elevation of one above another, only as men follow the practical duties of virtue and religion. But what serious reflections, or what lessons of morality, on the other hand, do the funerals of the world produce, if accompanied with pomp and splendor? To those, who have sober and serious minds, they produce a kind of pity that is mingled with disgust. In those of a ludicrous turn they provoke ludicrous ideas, when they see a dead body attended with such extravagant parade. To the vulgar and the ignorant no one useful lesson is given. Their senses are all absorbed in the show; and the thoughts of the worthlessness of man, as well as of death and the grave, which ought naturally to suggest themselves on such occasions, are swallowed up in the grandeur and pageantry of the procession. Funerals therefore of this kind are calculated to throw honor upon riches, abstractedly of moral merit; to make the creature of as much importance when dead as when alive; to lessen the humility of man; and to destroy of course the moral and religious feelings that should arise upon such occasions. Add to which, that such a conduct among Christians must be peculiarly improper. For the Christian dispensation teaches man, that he is to work out his salvation with "fear and trembling." It seems inconsistent, therefore, to accompany with all the outward signs of honor and greatness the body of a poor wretch, who has had this difficult and awful task to perform, and for whom, if we were to judge of him by the deeds done in the flesh, there would probably be reason to fear, that he had been criminally deficient in the execution of it.

Actuated by such sentiments as these, the Quakers have discarded all parade at their funerals. When they die, they are buried in a manner singularly plain. The corpse is deposited in a plain coffin. When carried to the meeting-house or grave-yard, it is attended by relations and friends. These have nothing different at this time, in their external garments, from their ordinary dress. Neither man nor horse is apparelled for the purpose. All pomp and parade, however rich the deceased may have been, are banished from their funeral-processions. The corpse at length arrives at the meeting-house.* It is suffered to remain there in the sight of the spectators.

*It is sometimes buried without being carried there.

The congregation then sit in silence, as at a meeting for worship. If any one feels himself induced to speak, he delivers himself accordingly; if not, no other rite is used at this time. In process of time the coffin is taken out of the meeting-house, and carried to the grave. Many of the acquaintance of the deceased, both members and others, follow it. It is at length placed by the side of the grave. A solemn silent pause immediately takes place. It is then interred. Another shorter pause then generally follows. These pauses are made, that the "spectators may be more deeply touched with a sense of their approaching exit, and their future state." If a minister or other person, during these pauses, has any observation or exhortation to make, (which is frequently the case) he makes it. If no person should feel himself impressed to speak, the assembled persons depart. The act of seeing the body deposited in the grave is the last public act of respect which the Quakers show to their deceased relations. This is the whole of the process of their funerals.

SECTION II.

Quakers use no vaults in their burying-grounds—Relations sometimes buried near each other, but oftener otherwise—They use no tomb-stones or monumental inscriptions—reasons for this disuse—but they sometimes record accounts of the lives, deaths, and dying sayings of their ministers.

The members of this Society, in the infancy of it, were buried in their gardens or orchards, or in the fields and premises of one another. They had at that time no grave-yards of their own. And they refused to be buried in those of the church, lest they should thus acknowledge the validity of a human appointment of the priesthood, the propriety of payment for gospel labor, and the peculiar holiness of consecrated ground. This refusal to be buried within the precincts of the church was considered as the bearing of their testimony for truth. In process of time, they raised their own meeting-houses, and had their respective burying places. These were not always contiguous, but sometimes at a distance from one another.

The Quakers have no sepulchers or arched vaults under ground for the reception of their dead. There have been here and there vaults, and there are here and there graves with sides of brick; but the coffins containing their bodies are usually committed to the dust.

I may observe also, that the Quakers are sometimes buried near their relations, but more frequently otherwise. In places where their population is thin, and the burial-ground large, a relation is buried next to a relation if it be desired. In other places, however, the graves are usually dug in rows, and the bodies deposited in them,

not as their relations lie, but as they happen to be opened in succession, without any attention to family-connections. When the first grave in the row is opened and filled, the person who dies next is put into that which is next to it; and the person who dies next, occupies that which is next to the second*. It is to many an endearing thought, that they shall lie after their death near the remains of those, whom they loved in life. But the Quakers in general have not thought it right or wise to indulge such feelings. They believe that all good men, however their bodies may be separated in their subterraneous houses of clay, will assuredly meet at the resurrection of the just.

They reject also the fashions of the world in the use of tomb-stones and monumental inscriptions. These are generally supposed to be erected out of respect to the memory or character of the deceased. The Quakers, however, are of opinion that this is not the proper manner of honoring the dead. If you wish to honor a good man, who has departed this life, let all his good actions live in your memory. Let them live in your grateful love and esteem. So cherish them in your heart, that they may constantly awaken you to imitation. Thus you will show, by your adoption of his amiable example, that you really respect his memory. This is also that tribute, which, if he himself could be asked in the other world how he would have his memory respected in this, he would prefer to any description of his virtues, that might be given by the ablest writer, or handed down to posterity by the ablest monument of the sculptor's art.

But they have an objection to the use of tomb-stones and monumental inscriptions for other reasons. For where pillars of marble, abounding with panegyric and decorated in a splendid manner, are erected to the ashes of dead men, there is a danger lest, by making too much of these, a superstitious awe should be produced, and a superstitious veneration should attach to them. The early Christians, by making too much of the relics of the saints or pious men, fell into such errors.

They believe, again, that, if they were to allow the custom of these outward monuments to obtain among them, they might be often led, as the world are, and by the same causes, to a deviation from the truth. For it is in human nature to praise those whom we love, bnt more particularly when we have lost them. Hence we find often such extravagant encomiums upon the dead, that, if it were

* By this process a small piece of ground will be longer in filling, no room being lost, and the danger and disagreeable necessity of opening graves, before bodies in them are decayed, is avoided.

possible for these to be made acquainted with them, they would show their disapprobation of such records. Hence we find also that as "false as an epitaph" has been a proberbial expression.

But even in the case where nothing more is said upon the tomb-stone, than what Moses said of Seth, and of Enos, and of Cainan, and others, when he reckoned up the genealogy of Adam, namely, that "they lived and that they died," the Quakers do not approve of such memorials. For these convey no merit of the deceased, by which his example should be followed. They convey no lesson of morality. And in general they are not particularly useful. They may serve, perhaps, to point out to surviving relations the place where the body of the deceased was buried, so that they may know where to mark out the line for their own graves. But as the members of this Society have in general overcome the prejudice of "sleeping with their fathers," such memorials cannot be useful to them.

They have no objection, however, if a man has conducted himself particularly well in life, that a true statement should be made concerning him, provided such a statement would operate as a lesson of morality to others; but they think that the tomb-stone is not the best medium of conveying it. They are persuaded that very little moral advantage is derived to the cursory readers of epitaphs, and that they can trace no improvement in morals to this source. Sensible, however, that the memorials of good men may be made serviceable to the rising generation, ("and there are no ideas," says Addison, "which strike more forcibly on our imaginations than those which are raised from reflections upon the exits of great and excellent men") they are willing to receive accounts of the lives, deaths, and remarkable sayings of those ministers in their own Society, who have been eminent for their labors. These are drawn up by individuals, and presented to the monthly meetings, to which the deceased belonged. But here they must undergo an examination before they are passed. The truth of the statement and the utility of the record must appear. It then falls to the quarterly meetings to examine them again; and these may alter, or pass, or reject them, as it may appear to be most proper. If these should pass them, they are forwarded to the yearly meeting. Many of them, after this, are printed; and, finding their way into the book-cases of the Quakers, they become collected lessons of morality, and operate as incitements to piety to the rising youth. Thus the memorials of men are made useful by the Society in an unobjectionable manner; for the falsehood and flattery of epitaphs are thus avoided, none but good men having been selected, whose virtues, if they are recorded, can be perpetuated with truth.

SECTION III.

They discard also mourning garments—These are only emblems of sorrow—and often make men pretend to be what they are not—This contrary to Christianity—Thus they may become little better than disguised pomp, or fashionable forms—This instanced in the change and duration of common mourning—and in the custom of court mourning—Ramification of the latter.

As the Quakers neither allow of the tomb-stones nor the monumental inscriptions, so they do not allow of the mourning garments, of the world.

They believe there can be no true sorrow but in the heart, and that there can be no other true outward way of showing it, than by fulfilling the desires, and by imitating the best actions, of those, whom men have lost and loved. "The mourning," says William Penn, "which it is fit for a Christian to have on the departure of beloved relations and friends, should be worn in the mind, which is only sensible of the loss. And the love which men have had to these, and their remembrance of them, should be outwardly expressed by a respect to their advice, and care of those they have left behind them, and their love of that which they loved."

But mourning garments, the Quakers contend, are only the emblems of sorrow. They will therefore frequently be used where no sorrow is. Many persons follow their deceased relatives to the grave, whose death, in point of gain, is a matter of real joy; witness young spendthrifts, who have been raising sum after sum on expectation, and calculating with voracious anxiety the probable duration of their relation's lives; and yet all these follow the corpse to the grave with white handkerchiefs, mourning habits, slouched hats and dangling hat-bands. Mourning garments, therefore, frequently make men pretend to be what they are not. But no true or consistent Christian can exhibit an outward appearance to the world, which his inward feelings do not justify.

It is not contended here by the Quakers, that, because a man becomes occasionally a hypocrite, this is a sufficient objection against any system; for a man may be an Atheist even in a Quaker's garb. Nor is it insinuated that individuals do not sometimes feel in their hearts the sorrow, which they propose to signify by their clothing. But it is asserted to be true, that men, who use mourning habits as they are generally used, do not wear them for those deceased persons only whom they loved, and abstain from the use of them where they had no esteem, but that they wear them promiscuously on all the occasions, which have been dictated by fashion. Mourning habits, therefore, in consequence of a long system of etiquette, have become

in the opinion of the Society, but little better than disguised pomp or fashionable forms.

I shall endeavor to throw some light upon this position of the Society, by looking into the practice of those of the world.

In the first place, there are seasons among these when full mourning, and seasons when only half mourning. is to be worn. Thus the habit is changed, and for no other reason than that of conformity with the laws of fashion. The length of the time also, or season of mourning is made to depend upon the scale of men's affinity to the deceased; though nothing can be more obvious, than that men's affection for the living, and their sorrow for them when dead, cannot be measured by this standard. Hence the very time that a man shall mourn, and the very time that he shall only half mourn, and the very time that he shall cease to mourn, are fixed for him by the world, whatever may be the duration of his own sorrows.

In court mourning, also, we have an instance of men being instructed to mourn, where their feelings are neither interested nor concerned. In this case the disguised pomp, spoken of by the Quakers, will be more apparent. Two princes have perhaps been fighting with each other for a considerable portion of their reign. The blood of their subjects has been spilt, and their treasures have been exhausted. They have probably had, during all this time, no kind disposition towards one another, each considering the other as the aggressor, or as the author of the war. When both have been wearied out with expense, they have made peace. But they have still mutual jealousies and fears. At length one of them dies. The other, on receiving an express relative to the event, orders mourning for the deceased for a given time. As other potentates receive the intelligence, they follow the example. Their several levees, or drawing-rooms, or places of public audience, are filled with mourning. Every individual of each sex, who is accustomed to attend them, is now habited in black. Thus a round of mourning is kept up by the courtiers of Europe, not by means of any sympathetic beating of the heart, but at the sound as it were of the postman's horn.

But let us trace this species of mourning further, and let us now look more particularly at the example of our own country, for the elucidation of the position in question. The same gazette, which gave birth to this black influenza at court, spreads it still further. The private gentlemen of the land undertake to mourn also. You see them accordingly in the streets, and in private parties, and at public places, in their mourning habits. Nor is this all. Military officers, who have fought against the armies of the deceased, wear crapes of sable over their arms, in token of the same sorrow.

But the fever does not stop even here. It still spreads, and, in tracing its progress, we find it to have attacked our merchants. Yes; the disorder has actually got upon 'Change. But what have I said? Mourning habits upon 'Change! where the news of an army cut to pieces produces the most cheerful countenances in many, if it raises the stocks but a half per cent.! Mourning habits upon 'Change! where contracts are made for human flesh and blood; where plans, that shall consign cargoes of human beings to misery and untimely death, and their posterity to bondage, are deliberately formed and agreed upon! O Sorrow, Sorrow, what hast thou to do upon 'Change, except in the case of commercial losses or disappointed speculation! But to add to this disguised pomp, as the Quakers call it, not one of ten thousand of the mourners ever saw the deceased prince; and perhaps ninety-nine in the hundred, of all who heard of him, reprobated his character when alive.

CHAPTER X.

Occupations of the Quakers—Agriculture declining among them—probable reasons of this decline—Country congenial to the quietude of mind required by their religion—Sentiments of Cowper—congenial also to the improvement or their moral feelings—Sentiments of William Penn—particularly suited to them, as lovers of the animal creation.

The Quakers generally bring up their children to some employment. They believe that these, by having an occupation, may avoid evils, into which they might otherwise fall, if they had upon their hands an undue proportion of vacant time. "Friends of all degrees," says the book of extracts, "are advised to take due care to breed up their children in some useful and necessary employment; that they may not spend their precious time in idleness, which is of evil example, and tends much to their hurt."

The Quakers have been described to be a domestic people, and as peculiarly cherishing domestic happiness. Upon this principle it is, combined with the ties of their discipline and peculiar customs, that we scarcely find any of this Society quitting their country, except for America, to reside as solitary merchants or factors in foreign parts. If it be a charge against the members of this Society, that they are eager in the pursuit of wealth, let it at least be mentioned in their favor, that, in their accumulation of it, they have been careful not to suffer their knowledge to take advantage of the

ignorance of others, and that they have kept their hands clear of the oppression and of the blood of their fellow-creatures.

In looking among the occupations of those in the Society, we shall find some, who are brought up as manufacturers and mechanics. But the number of these is small.

Others, but these are very few, follow the sea. There may be here and there a mate or captain in the coasting employ. In America, where they have great local and other advantages, there may be more in the sea-faring line. But, in general, the Quakers are domestic characters, and prefer a residence at home.

There are but few, also, who follow the professions. Their education and their religion exclude them from some of these. Some, however, are to be found in the department of medicine; and others, as conveyancers, in the law.

Several of them follow agriculture. But these are few, compared with the rest of the Society, or compared with the number of those, who formerly followed a rural life. Almost all the members of this Society were originally in the country, and but few of them in the towns: but this order of things is reversing fast. They are flocking into the towns, and abandoning agricultural pursuits.

The reasons that may be given for this change may be the following. It is not at all unlikely, that tithes may have had some influence in producing it. I am aware, however, it will be said, that a Quaker, living in the country, and strongly principled against these, would think it a dereliction of his duty to leave it on this account, and would remain upon the principle, that an abode there, under the annual exercise of his testimony, would, in a religious point of view, add strength to his strength. But it must be observed on the other hand, that where men are not obliged to remain under grievous evils, and can get rid of them merely by changing their occupation in life, and this honorably, it is in human nature to do it. And so far tithes, I believe, have had an influence in driving them into the towns. Of later years, as the Society has grown thinner in the country, I believe new reasons have sprung up. For they have had less opportunity of society with one another. They have been subjected also to greater inconvenience in attending their religious meetings. Their children, also, have been more exposed to improper connections in marriage. To which it may be added, that the large and rapid profits, frequently made in trade, compared with the generally small and slow returns from agricultural concerns, may probably have operated with many, as an inducement to such a change.

But whatever reasons may have induced them to quit the country,

and settle in towns, no temporal advantages can make up to them, as a Society, the measure of their loss. For, when we consider that the Quakers never partake of the amusements of the world; that their worldly pleasures are principally of a domestic nature; that calmness, and quietude, and abstraction from worldly thoughts, to which rural retirement is peculiarly favorable, is the state of mind, which they themselves acknowledge to be required by their religion, it would seem that the country was peculiarly the place for their habitations.

It would seem also, as if by his forsaking of the country they had deprived themselves of many opportunities of the highest enjoyment, of which they are capable as Quakers. The objects in the country are peculiarly favorable to the improvement of morality in the exercise of the spiritual feelings. The bud and the blossom, the rising and the falling leaf, the blade of corn and the ear, the seed-time and the harvest, the sun that warms and ripens, the cloud that cools, and emits the fruitful shower,—these, and many other objects, afford daily food for the religious growth of the mind. Even the natural man is pleased with these. They excite in him natural ideas, and produce in him a natural kind of pleasure. But the spiritual man experiences a sublimer joy. He sees none of these without feeling both spiritual improvement and delight. It is here that he converses with the Deity in his works. It is here that he finds himself grateful for his goodness; that he acknowledges his wisdom; that he expresses admiration of his power.

The poet Cowper, in his Contemplation of a Country Life, speaks forcibly on this subject:

"O friendly to the best pursuits of man,
Friendly to thought, to virtue, and to peace,
Domestic life, in rural leisure passed!
Few know thy value, and few taste thy sweets,
Though many boast thy favors, and affect
To understand and choose thee for their own.
But foolish man forgoes his proper bliss,
Ev'n as his first progenitor, and quits,
Though plac'd in Paradise (for Earth has still
Some traces of her youthful beauty left),
Substantial happiness for transient joy,
Scenes form'd for contemplation, and to nurse
The growing seeds of wisdom, that suggest,
By every pleasing image they present,
Reflections, such as meliorate the heart,
Compose the passions, and exalt the mind."

William Penn, in the beautiful letter, which he left his wife and children before his first voyage to America, speaks also in strong terms upon the point in question.

"But agriculture" says he, "is especially in my eye. Let my children be husbandmen and housewives. This occupation is industrious, healthy, honest, and of good example. Like Abraham and the holy antients, who pleased God, and obtained a good report, this leads to consider the works of God, and nature of things that are good, and diverts the mind from being taken up with the vain arts and inventions of a luxurious world." And a little further he says, "of cities and towns of concourse beware. The world is apt to stick close to those, who have lived and got wealth there. A country-life and estate I like best for my children. I prefer a decent mansion of a hundred pounds a year to ten thousand pounds in London or such-like place, in the way of trade."

To these observations it may be added, that the country, independently of the opportunity it affords for calmness and quietude of mind, and the moral improvement of it in the exercise of the spiritual feelings, is peculiarly fitted for the habitation of the Quakers, on account of their peculiar love for the animal-creation. It would afford them a wide range for the exercise of this love, and the improvement of the benevolent affections. For tenderness, if encouraged, like a plant that is duly watered, still grows. What man has ever shown a proper affection for the brute-creation, who has been backward in his love for a human race?

CHAPTER XI.

SECTION I.

Trade—Trade seldom considered as a question of morals—but Quakers view it in this light—prohibit the Slave-trade—privateering—manufactories of weapons of war—also trade where the revenue is defrauded—hazardous enterprises—fictitious paper—insists upon punctuality to words and engagements—advise an annual inspection of their own affairs—regulations in case of bankruptcy.

I STATED in the last chapter that some of the Quakers, though these were few in number were manufacturers and mechanics; that others followed the sea; that others were to be found in the medical profession, and in the law; and that others were occupied in the

concerns of a rural life. I believe, with these few exceptions, that the rest* of the Society may be considered as engaged in trade.

Trade is a subject, which seldom comes under the discussion of mankind as a moral question. If men, who follow it, are honest and punctual in their dealings, little is thought of the nature of their occupations, or of the influence of these upon the mind. It is hardly, however, denied by moralists, that the buying and selling of commodities for profit is surrounded with temptations, and is injurious to pure benevolent or disinterested feelings; or that, where the mind is constantly intent upon the gaining of wealth by traffic, it is dangerously employed. Much less will it be denied, that trade is an evil, if any of the branches of it, through which men acquire their wealth, are productive of mischief either to themselves or others. If they are destructive to the health of the inferior agents, or to the morality of the persons concerned in them, they must always be condemned by the Christian religion.

The Quakers have thought it their duty, as a religious body, to make several regulations on this subject. In the first place, they have made it a rule, that no person, acknowledged to be in profession with them, shall have any concern in the slave trade.

The Quakers began to consider this subject, as a Christian body, so early as in the beginning of the last century. In the year 1727, they passed a public censure upon this trade. In the year 1758, and afterwards in the year 1761, they warned and exhorted all in profession with them, "to keep their hands clear of this unrighteous gain of oppression." In the yearly meeting of 1763 they renewed their exhortations in the following words: "We renew our exhortation, that Friends every where be especially careful to keep their hands clear of giving encouragement in any shape to the slave-trade; it being evidently destructive to the natural rights of mankind, who are all ransomed by one Saviour, and visited by one divine light, in order to salvation: a traffic, calculated to enrich and aggrandize some upon the misery of others, in its nature abhorrent to every just and tender sentiment, and contrary to the whole tenor of the Gospel."

In the same manner, from the year 1763, they have publicly manifested a tender concern for the happiness of the injured Africans; and they have not only been vigilant to see that none of their own members were concerned in this impious traffic, but they have lent their assistance with other Christians in promoting its discontinuance.

---

* Except such as may have retired from business.

They have forbidden also the trade of privateering in war. They consider the capture of private vessels by private persons as a robbery committed on the property of others, which no human authority can make reconcileable to the consciences of honest individuals. And upon this motive they forbid it, as well as upon that of their known profession against war.

They forbid also the trade of the manufacturing of gun-powder, and of arms, or weapons of war, such as swords, guns, pistols, bayonets, and the like, that they may stand clear of the charge of having made any instrument, the avowed use of which is the destruction of human life.

They have forbidden also all trade that has for its object the defrauding the king either of his customs or his excise. They are not only not to smuggle themselves, but they are not to deal in such goods as they know, or such as they even suspect, to be smuggled, nor to buy any article of this description even for their private use. This prohibition is enjoined, because all Christians ought "to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;" because those, who are accessary to smuggling, give encouragement to perjury and bloodshed, these being frequently the attendants of such unlawful practices; and because they do considerable injury to the honest trader.

They discourage also concerns in hazardous enterprises in the way of trade. Such enterprises are apt to disturb the tranquility of the mind, and to unfit it for religious exercise. They may involve also the parties concerned and their families in ruin. They may deprive them again of the means of paying their just debts, and thus render them injurious to their creditors. Members, therefore, are advised to be rather content with callings, which may produce small but certain profits, than to hazard the tranquility of their minds, and the property of themselves and others.

In the exercise of those callings, which are deemed lawful by the Society, two things are insisted upon: first, that their members never raise and circulate "any fictitious kind of paper-credit with endorsements and acceptances, to give it an appearance of value without an intrinsic reality." Secondly, that they should pay particular attention to their words, and to the punctual performance of their engagements, and on no account delay their payments beyond the time they have promised. The Society have very much at heart the enforcement of the latter injunction, not only because all Christians are under an obligation to do these things, but because they wish to see the high reputation of their ancestors, in these respects, preserved among those of their own day. The primitive members were noticed for a scrupulous attention to their duty, as

Christians, in their commercial concerns. One of the great clamors against them, in the infancy of their institution, was, that they would get all the trade. It was nothing but their great honor in their dealings, arising from religious principle, that gave birth to this uproar, or secured them a more than ordinary portion of the custom of the world in the line of their respective trades.

Among the regulations made by the Quakers on the subject of trade, it is advised, publicly, to the members of the Society, to inspect the state of their affairs once a year: and, lest this advice should be disregarded, the monthly meetings are directed to make annual appointments of suitable Friends to communicate it to the members individually. But, independently of this public recommendation, they are earnestly advised by their Book of Extracts to examine their situations frequently. This is done with a view that they may see how they stand with respect to themselves, and with respect to the world at large; that they may not launch out into commercial concerns beyond their strength; nor live beyond their income; nor go on longer in their business than they can pay their debts.

If a Quaker, after this inspection of his affairs, should find himself unable to pay his just debts, he is immediately to disclose his affairs to some judicious members of the Society, or to his principal creditors, and to take their advice how he is to act, but to be particularly careful not to pay one creditor in preference of another.

When a person of the Society becomes a bankrupt, a committee is appointed by his own monthly meeting to confer with him on his affairs. If the bankruptcy should appear by their report to have been the result of misconduct, he is disowned. He may, however, on a full repentance, (for it is a maxim with the Society that "true repentance washes out all stains") and by a full payment of every man his own, be admitted into membership again. Or, if he has begun to pay his creditors, and has made arrangements satisfactory to the Society for paying them, he may be received as a member, even before the whole of the debt is settled.

If it should appear, on the other hand, that the bankruptcy was the unavoidable result of misfortune, and not of imprudence, he is allowed to continue in the Society.

But in either of these cases, that is, where a man is disowned and restored, or where he has not been disowned at all, he is never considered as a member, entitled to every privilege in the Society, till he has paid the whole of his debts. And the Quakers are so strict upon this point, that if a person has paid ten shillings in the pound, and his creditors have accepted the composition, and the law has

given him his discharge, it is insisted upon that he pay the remaining ten as soon as he is able. No distance of time will be any excuse to the Society for his refusal to comply with this honorable law. Nor will he be considered as a full member, as I observed before, till he has paid the uttermost farthing: for no collection for the poor, nor any legacy for the poor, or for other services of the Society, will be received from his purse, while any thing remains of the former debt. This rule of refusing charitable contributions on such occasions is founded on the principle, that money taken from a man in such a situation is taken from his lawful creditors, and that such a man can have nothing to give, while he owes any thing to another.

It may be observed of this rule or custom, that, as it is founded in moral principles, so it tends to promote a moral end. When persons of this description see their own donations dispensed with, but those of the rest of tne meeting taken, they are reminded of their own situation, and of the desirableness of making the full satisfaction required. The custom therefore operates as a constant memento that their debts are still hanging over them, and prompts to new industry and anxious exertion for their discharge. There are many instances of Quakers who have paid their compositions as others do, but who, after a lapse of many years, have surprised their former creditors by bringing them the remaining amount of their former debts. Hence the members of this Society are often enabled to say, what few others can say on the same subject, that they are not ultimately hurtful to mankind, either by their errors or by their misfortunes.

SECTION II.

But though the Quakers have made these regulations, the world finds fault with many of their trades or callings—several of these specified—standard proposed by which to examine them—some of these censurable by this standard—and given up by many Quakers on this account, though individuals may still follow them.

But though the Quakers have made these beautiful regulations concerning trade, it is manifest that the world are not wholly satisfied with their conduct on this subject. People charge them with the exercise of improper callings, or of occupations inconsistent with the principles they profess.

It is well known that the Quakers consider themselves as a highly professing people; that they declaim against the follies and vanities of the world; and that they bear their testimony against civil customs and institutions, even to personal suffering. Hence, professing more than others, more is expected from them. George Fox endeavored to inculcate this idea into his new society. In his letter to the

yearly meeting in 1679 he expresses himself as follows; "The world also does expect more from Friends than from other people, because they profess more. Therefore you should be more just than others in your words and dealings, and more righteous, holy, and pure, in your lives and conversation; so that your lives and conversations may preach. For the world's tongues and mouths have preached long enough; but their lives and conversations have denied what their tongues have professed and declared." I may observe, therefore, that the circumstance of a more than ordinary profession of consistency, and not any supposed immorality on the part of the Quakers, has brought them, in the instances alluded to, under the censure of the world. Other people, found in the same trades or occupations, are seldom noticed as doing wrong. But where men are set as lights upon a hill blemishes will be discovered in them, which will be overlooked among those, who walk in the vale below.

The trades or occupations, which are usually condemned as improper for Quakers to follow, are numerous. I shall not, therefore, specify them all. Those, however, which I propose to select, I shall accompany with all the distinctions, which equity demands on the occasion.

The trade of a distiller, or of a spirit-merchant, is considered as objectionable, if in the hands of a Quaker.

That of a cotton manufacturer, who employs a number of poor children in the usual way, or in a way which is destructive to their morals and to their health, is considered as equally deserving censure*.

There is a calling, which is seldom followed by itself; I mean the furnishing of funerals, or the serving of the pall. This is generally in the hands of cabinet-makers, or of upholsterers, or of woolen drapers. Now if any Quaker should be found in any of these occupations, and if he should unite with these that of serving the pall, he would be considered, by such an union, as following an objectionable trade. For the members of this society having discarded all the pomp, and parade, and dress connected with funerals, from their own practice, and this upon moral principles, it is insisted upon that they ought not to be accessary to the promotion of such ceremonials among others.

* Poor children are frequently sent by parishes to cotton-mills. Little or no care is taken of their morals. The men, when grown up, frequently become drunken, and the girls debauched. But the evil does not stop here. The progeny of these, vitiated by the drunkenness and debauchery of their parents, have usually diseased and crippled constitutions, which they perpetuate to a new generation; after which the whole race, I am told, generally becomes extinct. What Christian can gain wealth at the expense of the health, morals, and happiness of his fellow-creatures?

The trade of a printer, or bookseller, when exercised by a Quaker, has not escaped the animadversions of the world. A distinction, however, must be made here. They, who condemn this calling, can never do it justly but in supposed cases. They must suppose, for example, that the persons in question follow these callings generally, or that they do not make an exception with respect to the printing or selling of such books as may convey poison to the morals of those who read them.

A Quaker-tailor is considered as a character which cannot consistently exist. But a similar distinction must be made here as in the former case. It cannot surely be meant that, if a Quaker confines himself to the making of clothes for his own Society, he is reproachable for so doing, but only if he makes clothes for every one without distinction, following, as he is ordered, all the varying fashions of the world.

A Quaker-hatter is looked upon in the same light as a Quaker-tailor. But here a distinction suggests itself again. If he makes only plain and useful hats for the community and for other Quakers, it cannot be understood that he is acting inconsistently with his religious profession. The change can only lie against him, where he furnishes the hat with the gold and the silver-lace, or the lady's riding-hat with its ornaments, or the military hat with its lace, cockade, and plumes. In this case he will be considered as censurable by many, because he will be looked upon as a dealer in the superfluities condemned by his own religion.

The last occupation I shall notice is that of a silversmith. And here the censure will depend upon a contingency also. If a Quaker confines himself to the selling of plain silver articles for use, little objection can be raised against his employment. But if, in addition to this, he sells gold-headed canes, trinkets, rings, ear-rings, bracelets, jewels, and other ornaments of the person, he will be considered as chargeable with the same inconsistency as the follower of the former trade.

In examining these and other occupations of those in the Society, with a view if seeing how far the objections, which have been advanced against them, are valid, I own I have a difficult task to perform. For what standard shall I fix upon, or what limits shall I draw, on this occasion? The objections are founded in part upon the principle, that individuals ought not to sell those things, of which their own practice shows that they disapprove. But shall I admit this principle without any limitation or reserve? Shall I say, without any reserve, that a Quaker-woman, who discards the use of a simple ribbon from her dress, shall not sell it to another female, who

has been constantly in the habit of using it, and this without any detriment to her mind? Shall I say again, without any reserve, that a Quaker-man, who discards the use of black cloth, shall not sell a yard of it to another? And if I should say so, where am I to stop? Shall I not be obliged to go over all the colors in his shop, and object to all but the brown and drab? Shall I say again, without reserve, that a Quaker cannot sell any thing, which is innocent in itself, without inquiring of the buyer its application or its use? And if I should say so, might I not as well say that no Quaker can be in trade? I fear that to say this would be to get into a labyrinth, out of which there would be no clew to guide us.

Difficult, however, as the task may seem, I think I may lay down three positions, which will probably not be denied; and which, if admitted, will assist us in the determination of the question before us. The first of these is, that no menber of this Society can be concerned in a sale of a thing, which is evil in itself. Secondly, that he cannot encourage the sale of an article, which he knows to be essentially, or very generally, that is in seven cases out of ten, productive of evil. And thirdly, that he cannot sell things, which he has discarded from his own use, if he has discarded them on a belief that they are specifically forbidden by Christianity, or that they are morally injurious to the human mind.

If these positions be acknowledged, they will give ample latitude for the condemnation of many branches of trade.

A Quaker-bookseller, according to these positions, cannot sell a profane or improper book.

A Quaker-spirit-merchant cannot sell his liquor but to those, who he believes will use it in moderation, or medicinally, or on proper occasions.

A Quaker, who is a manufacturer of cotton, cannot exercise his occupation but upon an amended plan.

A Quaker-silversmith cannot deal in any splendid ornaments of the person. This he cannot do for the following reasons. The Quakers reject all such ornaments, because they believe them to be specifically condemned by Christianity. The words of the apostles Paul and Peter have been quoted both by Fox, Penn, Barclay, and others, upon this subject. But surely if the Christian religion positively condemn the use of them in one, it condemns the use of them in another. And how can any one, professing this religion, sell that, the use of which he believes to have been forbidden? The Quakers also have rejected all ornaments of the person, as we find by their own writers, on account of their immoral tendency, or because they are supposed to be instrumental in puffing up the crea-

ture, or in the generation of vanity and pride. But if they have rejected the use of them upon this principle, they are bound, as Christians, to refuse to sell them to others. Christian love, and the Christian obligation to do as we would wish to be done by, positively enjoin this conduct. For no man, consistently with this divine law and obligation, can sow the seeds of moral disease in his neighbor's mind.

And here I may observe that, though there are trades, which may be innocent in themselves, yet Quakers may make them objectionable by the manner in which they may conduct themselves in disposing of the articles, which belong to them. They can never pass them off, as other people do, by the declaration, that they are the fashionable articles of the day. Such words ought never to come out of their mouths; not so much because their own lives are a living protest against the fashions of the world, as because they cannot, knowingly, be instrumental in doing a moral injury to others. For it is undoubtedly the belief of the members of this Society, as I had occasion to observe in a former volume, that the following of such fashions begets a worldly spirit, and that in proportion as men indulge this spirit they are found to follow the loose and changeable morality of the world, instead of the strict and steady morality of the Gospel.

That some such positions as these may be fixed upon for the further regulation of commercial concerns among them is evident, when we consider the example of many estimable persons in this Society.

The Quakers, in the early times of their institution, were very circumspect about the nature of their occupations, and particularly as to dealing in superfluities and ornaments of the person. Gilbert Latey was one of those, who bore his public testimony against them. Though he was only a tailor, he was known, and highly spoken of, by King James the second. He would not allow his servants to put any corruptive finery upon the clothes, which he had been ordered to make for others. From Gilbert Latey I may pass to John Woolman. In examining the journal of the latter I find him speaking thus: "It had been my general practice to buy and sell things really useful. Things that served chiefly to please the vain mind in people, I was not easy to trade in; seldom did it; and whenever I did, I found it weaken me as a Christian." And from John Woolman I might mention the names of many, and, if delicacy did not forbid me, those of individuals now living, who relinguished or regulated their callings, on an idea that they could not consistently follow them at all, or that they could not follow them according to the

usual manner of the world. I knew the relation of a distiller, who left off his business upon principle. I was intimate with a Quaker-bookseller: He did not give up his occupation, for this was unnecessary; but he was scrupulous about the selling of an improper book. Another friend of mine, in the Society, succeeded but a few years ago to a draper's shop. The furnishing of funerals had been a profitable branch of the employ. But he refused to be concerned in this branch of it, wholly owing to his scruples about it. Another had been established as a silversmith for many years, and had traded in the ornamental part of the business; but he left it wholly, though advantageously situated, for the same reason, and betook himself to another trade. I know other individuals, who have held other occupations, not unusually objectionable by the world, who have become uneasy about them, and have relinquished them in their turn. These noble instances of the dereliction of gain, where it has interfered with principle, I feel it only justice to mention in this place. It is a homage due to Quakerism; for genuine Quakerism will always produce such instances. No true member will remain in any occupation, which he believes it improper to pursue. And I hope, if there are persons in the Society, who mix the sale of objectionable with that of the other articles of their trade, it is because they have entered into this mixed business without their usual portion of thought, or that the occupation itself has never come as an improper occupation before their minds.

Upon the whole, it must be stated, as I hinted before, that it is wholly owing to the more than ordinary professions of the Quakers, as a religious body, that the charges in question have been exhibited against such individuals among them as have been found in particular trades. If other people had been found in the same callings, the same blemishes would not have been so apparent. And if others had been found in the same callings, and it had been observed of these, that they had made all the beautiful regulations which I have shown the Society to have done on the subject of trade, these blemishes would have been removed from the usual range of the human vision. They would have been like spots in the sun's disk, which are hid from the observation of the human eye, because they are lost in the superior beauty of its blaze. But when the Quakers have been looked at solely as Quakers, or as men of high religious profession, these blemishes have become conspicuous. The moon, when it eclipses the sun, appears as a blemish in the body of that luminary. So a public departure from publicly professed principles will always be noticed, because it will be an excrescence or blemish too large and protuberant to be overlooked in the moral character.

CHAPTER XII.

Settlement of differences—Quakers, when they differ, abstain from violence—No instance of a duel—George Fox protested against going to law, and recommended arbitration—Laws relative to arbitration—Account of an arbitration-society at Newcastle-upon-Tyne on Quaker-principles—Its dissolution—Such societies might be usefully promoted.

Men are so constituted by nature, and the mutual intercourse between them is such, that circumstances must unavoidably arise, which will occasion differences. These differences will occasionally rouse the passions, and after all they will still be to be settled.

The Quakers, like other men, have their differences. But you rarely see any disturbance of the temper on this account. You rarely hear intemperate invectives. You are witness to no blows. If in the courts of law you have never seen their characters stained by convictions for a breach of the marriage-contract, or for the crime of adultery, so neither have you seen them disgraced by convictions of brutal violence, or that most barbarous of all Gothic customs, the duel.

It is a lamentable fact, when we consider that we live in an age removed above eighteen hundred years from the first promulgation of Christianity, one of the great objects of which was to insist upon the subjugation of the passions, that our children have not been better instructed; and that we should now have to behold men of apparently good education settling their disputes by an appeal to arms. It is difficult to conceive what preposterous principles can actuate men to induce them to such a mode of decision. Justice is the ultimate wish of every reasonable man in the termination of his casual differences with others. But in the determination of cases by the sword the injured man not unfrequently falls, while the aggressor sometimes adds to his offence, by making a widow, or an orphan, and by the murder of a fellow-creature. It is possible, however, the duellist may conceive that he adds to his reputation by decisions of this sanguinary nature. But surely he has no other reputation with good men than that of a weak, or a savage, or an infatuated creature; and if he falls, he is pitied by these on no other motive than that of his folly and of his crime. What philosopher can extol his courage, who, knowing the bondage of the mind while under the dominion of fashion, believes that more courage is necessary in refusing a challenge than in going to the field? What legislator can applaud his patriotism, when he sees him violate the laws of his

country? What Christian his religion, when he reflects on the relative duties of men, on the law of love and benevolence that should have guided him, on the principle that it is more noble to suffer than resist, and on the circumstance, that he may put himself into the doubly criminal situation of a murderer and a suicide by the same act?

George Fox, in his doctrines of the influence of the spirit as a divine teacher, and in that of the necessity of the subjugation of the passions, in order that the inward man might be in a fit state to receive its admonitions, left to they Society a system of education, which, if acted upon, could not fail of producing peaceable and quiet characters; but, foreseeing that among the best men differences would unavoidably arise from their intercourse in business and other causes, it was his desire, that these should be settled in a Christian manner. He advised, therefore, that no member should appeal to law; but that he should refer his difference to arbitration by persons of exemplary character in the Society. This mode of decision appeared to him to be consistent with the spirit of Christianity, and with the advice of the Apostle Paul, who recommended that all the differences among the Christians of his own time should be referred to the decision of the saints, or of such other Christians as were eminent for their lives and conversation.

This mode of decision, which began to take place among the Quakers in the time of George Fox, has been continued by them to the present day. Cases where property is concerned to the amount of many thousands, are determined in no other manner. By this process they obtain their verdicts in a way peculiarly satisfactory. For law suits are at best tedious. They often destroy brotherly love in the individuals, while they continue. They excite also, during this time, not unfrequently, a vindictive spirit, and lead to family feuds and quarrels. They agitate the mind also, hurt the temper, and disqualify a man for the proper exercise of his devotion. Add to this that the expenses of law are frequently so great, that burthens are imposed upon men for matters of little consequence, which they feel as evils and incumbrances for a considerable portion of their lives; burthens, which guilt alone, and which no indiscretion could have merited. Hence the members of this Society experience advantages in the settlement of their differences, which are known but to few others.

The Quakers, when any difference arises about things that are not of serious moment, generally settle it amicably between themselves; but in matters that are intricate and of weighty concern, they have recourse to arbitration. If it should happen that they are slow in

proceeding to arbitration, overseers, or any others of the Society, who may come to the knowledge of the circumstance, are to step in and to offer their advice. If their advice is rejected, complaint is to be made to their own monthly meeting concerning them, after which they will come under the discipline of the Society; and if they still persist in refusing to settle their differences, or to proceed to arbitration, they may be disowned. I may mention here, that any member going to law with another, without having previously tried to accommodate matters between them, according to the rules of the Society, comes under the discipline in the like manner.

When arbitration is determined upon, the individuals concerned are enjoined to apply to persons of their own Society to decide the case. It is considered, however, desirable, that they should not trouble their ministers if they can help it on these occasions, as the minds of these ought to be drawn out as little as possible into worldly concerns.

The following is a concise statement of the rules recommended by the Society in the case of arbitrations:

Each party is to choose one or two friends as arbitrators, and all the persons so chosen are to agree upon a third or fifth. The arbitrators are not to consider themselves as advocates for the party, by whom they were chosen, but as men, whose duty it is to judge righteously, fearing the Lord. The parties are to enter into engagements to abide by the award of the arbitrators. Every meeting of the arbitrators is to be made known to the parties concerned, till they have been fully heard. No private meetings are allowed between some of the arbitrators, or with one party separate from the other, on the business referred to them. No representation of the case of one party, either by writing or otherwise, is to be admitted without its being made fully known to the other, and, if required, a copy of such representation is to be delivered to the other party. The arbitrators are to hear both parties fully in the presence of each other, whilst either has any fresh matter to offer, for a time mutually limited. In the case of any doubtful point of law, the arbitrators are jointly to agree upon a case, and to consult counsel. It is recommended to arbitrators to propose to the parties that they should give an acknowledgment in writing, before the award is made, that they have been candidly and fully heard.

In the same manner as a member proceeds with a member in the case of any difference, he is led by his education and habits to proceed with others, who are not of the same Society. A Quaker seldom goes to law with a person of another denomination, till he has proposed arbitration. If the proposal be not accepted, he has then

no remedy but the law. For a person who is out of the Society, cannot be obliged upon pain of disownment, as one who is in it may, to submit to such a mode of decision, being out of the reach of the Quaker-discipline.

I shall close my observations upon this subject by giving an account of an institution for the accommodation of differences, which took place in the year 1793, upon the principles of this Society.

In the town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, a number of disputes were continually arising on the subject of shipping-concerns, which were referred to the decision of the laws. These decisions were often grievously expensive. They were, besides, frequently different from what seafaring persons conceived to be just. The latter circumstance was attributed to the ignorance of lawyers in maritime affairs. Much money was therefore often expended, and no one satisfied. Some Quakers in the neighborhood, in conjunction with others, came forward with a view of obviating these evils. They proposed arbitration as a remedy. They met with some opposition at first, but principally from gentlemen of the law. After having, however, shown the impropriety of many of the legal verdicts that had been given, they had the pleasure of seeing their plan publicly introduced and sanctioned. For in the month of June, 1793, a number of gentlemen respectable for their knowlege in mercantile and maritime affairs, met at the Trinity-hall in Newcastle, and associated themselves for these and other purposes, calling themselves "The Newcastle-upon-Tyne association for general arbitration."

This association was to have four general meetings in the year, one in each quarter, at which they were to receive cases. For any urgent matter, however, which might occur, the clerk was to have the power of calling a special meeting.

Each person, on delivering a case, was to pay a small fee. Out of these fees the clerk's salary and incidental expenses were to be paid. But the surplus was to be given to the poor.

The parties were to enter into arbitration-bonds, as is usual upon such occasions.

Each party was to choose out of this association, or standing committee, one arbitrator for himself, and the association were to choose or to ballot for a third. And here it will be proper to observe, that this standing association appeared to be capable of affording arbitrators equal to the determination of every case. For, if the matter in dispute between the two parties were to happen to be a mercantile question, there was merchants in the association. If a question relative to shipping, there were ship-owners in it. If a question of insurance, there were insurance-brokers also. A man could hardly

fail of having his case determined by persons, who were competent to the task.

Though this beautiful institution was thus publicly introduced, and introduced with considerable expectations and applause, cases came in but slowly. Custom and prejudice are not to be rooted out in a moment. In process of time, however, several were offered, considered, and decided, and the presumption was, that the institution would have grown with time. Of those cases, which were determined, some relating to ships were found to be particularly intricate, and cost the arbitrators considerable time and trouble. The verdicts, however, which were given, were in all of them satisfactory. The institution at length became so popular, that, incredible to relate, its own popularity destroyed it! So many persons were ambitious of the honor of becoming members of the committee, that some of inferior knowledge and judgment, and character, were too hastily admitted into it. The consequence was, that people dared not trust their affairs to the abilities of every member, and the institution expired, after having rendered important service to numerous individuals, who had tried it.

When we consider that this institution has been tried, and that the scheme of it has been found practicable, it is a pity that its benefits should have been confined, and this for so short a period, to a single town. Would it not be desirable, if, in every district, a number of farmers were to give in their names to form a standing committee, for the settlement of disputes between farmer and farmer? or that there should be a similar institution among manufacturers, who should decide between one manufacturer and another? Would it not also be desirable, if, in every parish, a number of gentlemen, or other respectable persons, were to associate for the purpose of accommodating the differences of each other? For this beautiful system is capable of being carried to any extent, and of being adapted to all stations and conditions of life. By these means numerous little funds might be established in numerous districts, from the surplus of which an opportunity would be afforded of adding to the comforts of such of the poor as were to distinguish themselves by their good behavior, whether as laborers for farmers, manufacturers, or others. By these means, also, many of the quarrels in the parishes might be settled to the mutual satisfaction of the parties concerned, and in so short a space of time as to prevent them from contracting a rancorous and a wounding edge. Those, on the other hand, who were to assist in these arbitrations, would be amply repaid; for they would be thus giving an opportunity of growth to the benevolent feelings, and they would have the pleasing reflection, that

the tendency of their labors would be to promote peace and good-will amongst men.

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION I.

Management of the poor—Quakers never seen as beggars—George Fox began the provision for the Quaker-poor—Monthly meetings appoint overseers—Persons, passed over, are to apply for relief—and the disorderly may receive it in certain cases—Manner of collecting for the poor—if burthensome in one monthly meeting, the burthen shared by the quarterly—Quakers gain settlements by monthly meetings as the other poor of the kingdom by parishes.

There are few parts of the Quaker-constitution, that are more worthy of commendation than that which relates to the poor. All the members of this Society are considered as brethren, and as entitled to support from one another. If our streets or our roads are infested by miserable objects imploring our pity, no Quaker will be found among them. A beggar of this denomination would be a phenomenon in the world.

It does not, however, follow from this account that there are no poor Quakers, or that members of this Society are not born in a dependent state. The truth is, that there are poor as well as rich, but the wants of the former are so well provided for, that they are not publicly seen, like the wants of others.

George Fox, as he was the founder of the religion of the Quakers, I mean of a system of renovated Christianity, so he was the author of the beautiful scheme, by which they make a provision for their poor. As a Christian, he considered the poor of every description as members of the same family, but particularly those, who were of the household of faith. Consistently with this opinion, he advised the establishment of general meetings in his own time, a special part of whose business it was to take due care of the poor. These meetings excited at first the vigilance and anger of the magistrates; but, when they came to see the regulations made by the members of this Society, in order that none of their poor might become burthensome to their parishes, they went away, whatever they might think of some of their new tenets of religion, in admiration of their benevolence.

The Quakers of the present day consider their poor in the same light as their venerable elder, namely, as members of the same

family, whose wants it is their duty to relieve, and they provide for them nearly in the same manner. They intrust this important concern to the monthly meetings, which are the executive branches of their constitution. The monthly meetings appoint four overseers, two men and two women, over each particular meeting within their own jurisdiction, if their number will admit of it. It is the duty of these to visit such of the poor as are in membership; of the men to visit the men, but of the women sometimes to visit both. The reason why this double burthen is laid upon the woman-overseers is, that women know more of domestic concerns, more of the wants of famliies, more of the manner of providing for them, and are better advisers and better nurses in sickness than the men. Whatever these overseers find wanting in the course of their visits, whether money, clothes, medicines, or medical advice and attention, they order them, and the treasurer of the monthly meetings settles the different accounts.* I may observe here, that it is not easy for overseers to neglect their duty; for an inquiry is made three times in the year of the monthly meetings by the quarterly, whether the necessities of the poor are properly inspected and relieved. I may observe also, that the poor, who may stand in need of relief, are always relieved privately, I mean at their respective homes.

It is, however, possible, that there may be persons, who, from a variety of unlooked-for causes, may be brought into distress, and whose case, never having been suspected, may be passed over. But persons in this situation are desired to apply for assistance. It is also a rule in the Society, that even persons, whose conduct is disorderly, are to be relieved, if such conduct has not been objected to by their own monthly meeting. "The want of due care," says the Book of Extracts, "in watching diligently over the flock, and in dealing in due time with such as walk disorderly, hath brought great difficulties on some meetings; for we think it both unseasonable and dishonorable, when persons apply to monthly meetings for relief, in cases of necessity, then to object to them such offences as the meeting, through the neglect of its own duty, hath suffered long to pass by unreproved and unnoticed."

The poor are supported by charitable collections from the body at large; or, in other words, every monthly meeting supports its own poor. The collections for them are usually made once a month, but in some places once a quarter, and in others at no stated times, but when the treasurer declares them necessary and the monthly meet-

*In London a committee is appointed for each poor person. Thus, for example, two women are appointed to attend to the wants and comforts of one poor old woman.

ing approves. Members are expected to contribute in proportion to their circumstances; but persons in a low situation, and servants, are generally excused upon these occasions.

It happens in the district of some monthly meetings, that there are found only few persons of property but a numerous poor, so that the former are unable to do justice in their provision for the latter. The Society have therefore resolved, when the poor are too numerous to be supported by their own monthly meetings, that the collections for them shall be made up out of the quarterly meeting, to which the said monthly meeting belongs. This is the same thing as if any particular parish were unable to pay the rates for the poor, and as if all the other parishes in the country were made to contribute towards the same.

On this subject I may observe, that the poor, belonging to the Society, are attached to their monthly meetings as the common poor of the kingdom are attached to their parishes, and that they gain settlements in these nearly in the same manner.

SECTION II.

Education of the children of the poor particularly insisted upon and provided for by the Quakers—The boys usually put out to aprenticeship—the girls to service—The latter not sufficiently numerous for the Quaker-families who want them—The rich have not their proportion of these in their service—reputed reasons of it—Character of the Quaker-poor.

As the Quakers are particularly attentive to the wants of the poor, so they are no less attentive to the instruction of their offspring. These are all of them to receive their education at the public expense. The same overseers, as in the former case, are to take care of it, and the same funds to support it. An inquiry is therefore made three times in the year into this subject. "The children of the poor," says the Book of Extracts, "are to have due help of education, instruction, and necessary learning." The families also of the poor are to be provided with Bibles, and books of the Society, at the Expense of the monthly meetings. And as some members may be straitened in their circumstances, and may refuse out of delicacy to apply for aid towards the education of their children, it is earnestly recommended to Friends in every monthly meeting, to look out for persons, who may be thus straitened, and to take care that their children shall receive instruction; and it is recommended to the parents of such, not to refuse this salutary aid, "but to receive it with a willing mind, and with thankfulness to the great Author of all good."

When the boys have received their necessary learning, they are

usually put out as apprentices to husbandry or trade. Domestic service is generally considered by the parents as unmanly, and as a nursery for idleness. Boys too, who can read and write, ought to expect, with the accustomed diligence and sobriety of the members of this Society, to arrive at a better situation in life. The girls, however, are destined in general for service; for it must be obvious whatever their education may be, that the same number of employments is not open to women as to men. Of these, again, which are open, some are objectionable. A Quaker-girl, for example, could not consistently be put an apprentice to a milliner. Neither, if a cotton-manufactory were in the neighborhood, could her parents send her to such a nursery of debauchery and vice. From these and other considerations, and because domestic employments belong to women, their parents generally think it advisable to bring them up to service, and to place them in the families of Friends.

It is a remarkable circumstance, when we consider it to be recommended that Quaker-masters of families should take Quaker-servants, that persons of the latter description are not found to be sufficiently numerous for those who want them. This is probably a proof of the rising situation of this Society. It is remarkable, again, that the rich have by no means their proportion of such servants. Those of the wealthy, who are exemplary, get them if they can. Others decline their services. Of these some do it from good motives; for, knowing that it would be difficult to make up their complement of servants from the Society, they do not wish to break in upon the customs and morals of those belonging to it by mixing them with others. The rest, who mix more with the world, as I have been informed, are fearful of having them, lest they should be overseers of their words and manners. For it is in the essence of the discipline of the Society, as I observed upon that subject, that every member should watch over another for his good. There are no exceptions as to persons. The servant has as much right to watch over his master, with respect to his religious conduct and conversation, as the master over his servent; and he has also a right, if his master violates the discipline, to speak to him, in a respectful manner, for so doing. Nor would a Quaker-servant, if he were well grounded in the principles of the Society, and felt it to be his duty, want the courage to speak his mind upon such occasions. There have been instances where this has happened, and where the master, in the true spirit of his religion, has not felt himself insulted by such interference, but has looked upon his servant afterwards as more worthy of his confidence and esteem. Such a right, however, of remonstrance, is, I presume, but rarely exercised.

I cannot conclude this subject without saying a few words on the character of the Quaker-poor.

In the first place, I may observe, that one of the great traits in their character is independence of mind. When you converse with them, you find them attentive, civil, and obliging; but you see no marks of servility about them, and you hear no flattery from their lips. It is not the custom of this Society, even for the poorest member to bow, or to pull off his hat, or to observe any outward obeisance to another, who may happen to be rich. Such customs are forbidden to all, upon religious principles. In consequence therefore of the omission of such ceremonious practices, his mind has never been made to bend on the approach of superior rank. Nor has he seen, in his own society, any thing that could lessen his own importance or dignity as a man. He is admitted into the meetings for discipline equally with the rich. He has a voice equally with them in all matters that are agitated there. From these causes a manliness of mind is produced, which is not seen among any other of the poor in the island, in which we live.

It may also be mentioned as a second trait in their character, that they possess extraordinary knowledge. Every Quaker-boy or girl, who comes into the world, must, however poor, if the discipline of the Society be kept up, receive an education. All, therefore, who are born in the Society, must be able to read and write. Thus the keys of knowledge are put into their hands. Hence we find them attaining a superior literal and historical knowledge of the Scriptures, a superior knowledge of human nature, and a knowledge that sets them above many of the superstitions of those of their own rank in life.

Another trait conspicuous in the character of the poor of the Society is the morality of their lives.

This circumstance may easily be accounted for. For, in the first place, they are hindered in common with other Members, by means of their discipline, from doing many things that are morally injurious to themselves. The poor of the world are addicted to profane swearing. But no person can bring the name of the Creator of the universe into frequent and ordinary use, without losing a sense of the veneration that is due to Him. The poor of the world, again, frequently spend their time in public houses. They fight and quarrel with one another. They run after horse-racings, bull-baitings, cock-fightings, and the still more unnatural battles between man and man. But, by encouraging such habits, they cannot but obstruct in time the natural risings of benevolence, both towards their fellow-creatures, and to the animal-creation. Nor can they do otherwise than lose a sense of the dignity of their own minds, and weaken

the moral principle. But the Quaker-poor, who are principled against such customs, can of course suffer no moral injury on these accounts. To which it may be added that their superior knowledge both leads and attaches them to a superior conduct. It is a false as well as a barbarous maxim, and a maxim very injurious both to the interests of the rich and of the poor, as well as of the state to which they belong, that knowledge is unpropitious to virtue.

RELIGION OF THE QUAKERS.

INTRODUCTION.

Religion of the Quakers—Invitation to a patient perusal of this part of the work—No design by this invitation to proselyte to Quakerism—All systems of religion that are founded on the principles of Christianity are capable, if heartily embraced, of producing present and future happiness to man—No censure of another's creed warrantable, inasmuch as the understanding is finite—Object of this invitation.

Having explained very diffusively the three great subjects, the Moral Education, Discipline, and Peculiar Customs of the Quakers, I propose to allot the remaining part of this volume to the consideration of their Religion.

I know that persons who are religiously disposed, will follow me patiently through this division of my work, not only because religion is the most important of all subjects that can be agitated, but because, in the explanation of the religious systems of others, some light may arise, which, though it may not be new to all, may yet be new and acceptable to many. I am aware, however, that there are some, who direct their reading to light subjects, and to whom such as are serious may appear burthensome. If any such should have been induced by any particular motive to take this book into their hands, and to accompany me thus far I entreat a continuation of their patience, till I have carried them through the different parts and divisions of the present subject.

I have no view, in thus soliciting the attention of those who are more, or of those who are less, religiously disposed, to attempt to proselyte to Quakerism. If men do but fear God and work righteousness, whatever their Christian denomination may be, it is sufficient. Every system of religion, which is founded on the principles of Christianity, must be capable, if heartily embraced, of producing temporal and eternal happiness to man. At least man, with his limited understanding, cannot pronounce, with any absolute certainty, that his own system is so far preferable to that of his neighbor, that it is positively the best; or that there will be any material difference in the future happiness of those, who follow the one or the other; or that the pure professors of each shall not have their pecu-

liar rewards. The truth is, that each system has its own merits. Each embraces great and sublime objects. And if good men have existed, as none can reasonably deny, before Christianity was known, it would be a libel on Christianity to suppose, either that good men had not existed since, or that good Christians would not be ultimately happy, though following systems differing from those of one another. Indeed every Christian community has a great deal to say in the defense of its own tenets. Almost all Christian churches have produced great characters: and there are none, I should hope, that had not been the authors of religious good. The church of England, in attempting to purify herself at the Reformation, effected a great work. Since that time she has produced at different periods, and continues to produce, both great and good men. By means of her universities, she has given forth, and keeps up and disseminates, a considerable portion of knowledge; and though this, in the opinion of the Quakers, is not necessary for those, who are to become ministers of the gospel, it cannot be denied that it is a source of temporary happiness to man; that it enlarges the scope of his rational and moral understanding; and that it leads to great and sublime discoveries, which become eminently beneficial to mankind. Since that time she has also been an instrument of spreading over this kingdom a great portion of religious light, which has had its influence in the production of moral character. But though I bestow this enconium upon the established church, I should be chargeable with partiality and injustice, if I were not to allow that among the dissenters, of various descriptions, learned, pious, and great men had been regularly and successively produced. And it must be confessed, and reflected upon with pleasure, that these, in proportion to their numbers, have been no less instrumental in the dissemination of Religious knowledge, and in the production of religious conduct. I might go to large and populous towns and villages in the kingdom, and fully prove my assertion in the reformed manners of the poor, many of whom, before these pious visitations, had been remarkable for the profaneness of their lives.

Let us then not talk but with great deference and humility, with great tenderness and charity, with great thankfulness to the Author of every good gift, when we speak of the different systems that actuate the Christian world. Why should we consider our neighbor as an alien, and load him with reproaches, because he happens to differ from us in opinion about an article of faith? As long as there are men, so long there will be different measures of talents and understanding; and so long will they view things in a different light, and come to different conclusions concerning them. The eye of one man

can see further than that of another. So can the human mind on the subject of speculative truths. This consideration should teach us humility and forbearance in judging of the religion of others. For who is he, who can say that he sees the furthest, or that his own system is the best? If such men as Milton, Whiston, Boyle, Locke, and Newton, all agreeing in the profession of Christianity, did not all think precisely alike concerning it, who art thou, with thy inferior capacity, who settest up the standard of thine own judgment as infallible? If thou sendest thy neighbor to perdition in the other world, because he does not agree in his creed with thee, know that he judges according to the best of his abilities, and that no more will be required of him. Know also that thou thyself judgest like a worm of the earth; that thou dishonorest the Almighty by thy reptile notions of him; and that, in making him accord with thee in condemning one of His creatures for what thou conceivest to be the misunderstanding of a speculative proposition, thou treatest him like a man, as thou thyself art, with corporeal organs, with irritable passions, and with a limited intelligence. But if, besides this, thou condemnest thy neighbor in this world also, and feelest the spirit of persecution towards him, know that, whatever thy pretensions may be to religion, thou art not a Christian. Thou art not possessed of that charity or love, without which thou art but as a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.

Having therefore no religious prejudices* myself except in favor of Christianity, and holding no communion with the Quakers as a religious society, it cannot be likely that I should attempt to proselyte to Quakerism. I wish principally, as I stated in my introduction to this work, to make the members of this community better known to their countrymen than they are at present. In this I think I have already succeeded; for I believe I have communicated many facts concerning them, which have never been related by others. But no people can be thoroughly known, or at least the character of a people cannot be thoroughly understood, unless we are acquainted with their religion. Much less can that of those under our consideration, who differ so materially, both in their appearance and practice, from the rest of their fellow-citizens.

Having thought it right to make these prefatory observations, I proceed to the prosecution of my work.

---

* Though I conceive a charitable allowance ought to be made for the diversity of religious opinions among Christians, I by no means intend to say, that it is not our duty to value the system of opinion, which we think most consonant to the gospel, and to be wisely zealous in its support.

CHAPTER I.

The Almighty created the universe by means of his Spirit—and also man—He gave man, besides his intellect, an emanation from his own spirit, thus making him in his own image—but this image he lost—a portion, however, of the same Spirit was continued to his posterity—These possessed it in different degrees—Abraham, Moses, and the prophets had more of it than some others—Jesus possessed it immeasurably, and without limit—Evangelists and apostles possessed it, but in a limited manner and in different degrees.

THE Quakers believe, that, when the Almighty created the universe, he effected it by means of the life, or vital or vivifying energy, that was in his own Spirit. "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

This life of the Spirit has been differently named, but is concisely styled by St. John the evangelist, the Word; for he says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made."

The Almighty also, by means of the same divine energy, or life of the Spirit, which has thus created the universe, became the cause of material life and of vital functions. He called forth all animated nature into existence. For he "made the living creature after his kind."

He created Man also by the same power. He made his corporeal and organic nature. He furnished him also with intellect, or a mental understanding. By this latter gift he gave to Man, what he had not given to other animated nature, the power of reason, by which he had the superiority over it, and by means of which he was enabled to guide himself in his temporal concerns.

But he gave to Man at the same time, independently of this intellect or understanding, a spiritual faculty, or a portion of the life of his own Spirit, to reside in him. This gift occasioned Man to become more immediately, as is expressed, the image of the Almighty. It set him above the animal and rational part of his nature. It made him know things not intelligible solely by his reason. It made him spiritually-minded. It enabled him to know his duty to God, and to hold a heavenly intercourse with his Maker.

Adam then, the first man, independently of his rational faculties, received from the Almighty into his own breast such an emanation from the life of his own Spirit, as was sufficient to have enabled him both

to hold. and to have continued, a spiritual intercourse with his Maker, and to have preserved him in the state of innocence in which he had been created. As long as he lived in this divine light of the Spirit, he remained in the image of God, and was perfectly happy; but, not attending faithfully and perseveringly to this his spiritual monitor, he fell into the snares of Satan, or gave way to the temptations of sin. From this moment his condition became changed. For in the same manner as distemper occasions animal-life to droop, and to lose its powers, and finally to cease, so unrighteousness, or his rebellion against this divine light of the Spirit that was within him, occasioned a dissolution of his spiritual feelings and perceptions; for he became dead, as it were, in consequence, as to any knowledge of God, or enjoyment of his presence.*

It pleased the Almighty, however, not wholly to abandon him in this wretched state, but he comforted him with the cheering promise, that the seed of the woman should some time or other completely subdue sin, or, to use the Scripture language, "should bruise the Serpent's head;" or, in other words, as sin was of a spiritual nature, so it could only be overcome by a spiritual conqueror: and therefore that the same Holy Spirit, or Word, or Divine Principle of Light and Life, which had appeared in creation, should dwell so entirely, and without limit or measure, in the person or body of some one of his descendants, that sin should by him be entirely subdued.

As God then poured into Adam, the first man, a certain portion of his own Spirit, or gave him a certain portion of the divine Light, for the regulation of his spiritual conduct, and the power of heavenly intercourse with himself; so he did not entirely cease from bestowing his Spirit upon his posterity: or, in other words, he continued to them a portion of that Light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world. Of the individuals, therefore, who succeeded Adam, all received a portion of this Light. Some, however, enjoyed larger portions of it than others, according as they attended to its influences, or according to the measure given them. Of those, who possessed the greatest share of it, some were the ancient patriarchs, such as Noah and Abraham; and others were the ancient scriptural writers, such as Moses and the Prophets. The latter, again, experienced it in different measures or degrees; and in proportion as they had it, they delivered, more or less, those prophe-

* It was said, that in the day in which Adam eat the forbidden fruit he should die; but he did not lose his animal life, or his rational nature. His loss therefore is usually considered by the Quakers to have been a divine spiritual principle, which had been originally superadded to the rational and animal faculties.

cies, which are usually considered as inspired truths, from a belief that many of them have been circumstantially completed.

At length, in the fulness of time, that is, when all things had been fulfilled, which were previously to take place, this divine Spirit, which had appeared in creation, or this divine Word, or Light, took flesh, (for, as St. John the evangelist says, "the Word was made flesh, and dwelled among us,") and inhabited the body, "which had been prepared for it;" or, in other words, it inhabited the body of the person Jesus; but with this difference, that whereas only a portion of this divine Light or Spirit had been given to Adam, and afterwards to the prophets, it was given, without limit or measure, to the man Jesus.* "For he, whom God hath sent," says St. John, "speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him." And St. Paul says,† "In him the fulness of the Godhead dwelled bodily." In him therefore the promise given to Adam was accomplished, "that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head:" for we see, in this case, a human body, weak and infirm, and subject to passions, possessed or occupied without limit or measure by the Spirit of God. But if the man Jesus had the full Spirit of God within him, he could not be otherwise than perfectly holy. And, if so, sin never could have entered, and must therefore, as far as relates to him, have been entirely repelled. Thus he answered the prophetic character, which had been given him, independently of his victory over sin by the sacrifice of himself, or by becoming afterwards a comforter to those in bondage, who should be willing to receive him.

After Jesus Christ came the Evangelists and Apostles. Of the same Spirit, which he had possessed immeasurably, these had their several portions; and though these latter were limited,‡ and differed in degree from one another, they were sufficient to enable them to do their duty to God and men, to enjoy the presence of the Almighty, and to promote the purposes designed by him in the propagation of his Gospel.

---

*John iii. 34. †Coloss. ii. 9. ‡2 Cor. x. 13.

CHAPTER II.

Unless a man has a portion of the same Spirit, which Jesus and the prophets and the apostles had, he can have no knowledge of God or spiritual things—Doctrine of St. Paul on this subject—This confirms the history of the human and divine Spirit in man—these spirits distinct in their kind—This distinction further elucidated by a comparison between the faculties of men and brutes—Sentiments of Augustine—Luther—Calvin—Smith—Cudworth.

The members of this community believe that there can be no spiritual knowledge of God, but through the medium of his holy Spirit; or, in other words, that if men have not a portion of the same Spirit, which the holy men of old, and which the evangelists and apostles, and which Jesus himself had, they can have no true or vital religion.

In favor of this proposition they usually quote those remarkable words of the apostle Paul,* "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the Spirit of a man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the Spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." And again: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

By these expressions the Quakers conceive that the history of man, as explained in the last chapter, is confirmed, or that the Almighty not only gave to man reason, which was to assist him in his temporal, but also superadded a portion of his own Spirit, which was to assist him in his spiritual concerns. They conceive it also to be still further confirmed by other expressions of the same apostle. In his first letter to the Corinthians, he says,† "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God?" And in his letter to Timothy, he desires him‡ "to hold fast that good thing, which was committed to him by means of the Holy Ghost, which dwelled in him." Now these expressions can only be accurate on a supposition of the truth of the history of man as explained in the former chapter. If this history be true, then they are considered as words of course: for, if there be a communication between the Supreme Being and his creature Man, or if the Almighty has afforded to man an emanation of his own Spirit, which is to act

*1 Cor. ii, 11 &c. †1 Cor. vi. 19. ‡2 Tim. 1, 14.

in his mortal body, for spiritual purposes, we may say with great consistency, that the Divinity resides in him, or that his body is the temple of the Holy Spirit.

They conceive again from these expressions of the Apostle, that these two principles in man are different from each other. They are mentioned under the distinct names of the Spirit of Man, and of the Spirit of God. The former they suppose to relate to the understanding; the latter conjointly to the understanding and to the heart. The former can be brought into use at all times, if the body of a man is in health. The latter is not at his own disposal. Man must wait for its inspirations. Like the wind, it bloweth when it listeth. Man also, when he feels this divine influence, feels that it is distinct from his reason. When it is gone he feels the loss of it, though all his rational faculties be alive. "Those," says Alexander Arscott, "who have this experience certainly know, that as at times, in their silent retirements and humble waitings upon God, they receive an understanding of His will relating to their present duty, in such a clear light as leaves no doubt or hesitation; so at other times, when this is withdrawn from them, they are at a loss again, and see themselves, as they really are, ignorant and destitute."

They understand again by these expressions of the Apostle (which is the point insisted upon in this chapter) that human reason or the spirit of man, which is within him, and the Divine Principle of Life and Light, which is the Spirit of God residing in his body or temple are so different in their powers, that the former cannot enter into the province of the latter. As water cannot penetrate the same bodies which fire can, so neither can reason the same subjects as the spiritual faculty. The Quakers, however, do not deny that human reason is powerful within its own province. It may discover, in the beautiful structure of the universe, and in the harmony and fitness of all its parts, the hand of a great contriver. It may conclude upon attributes belonging to the same. It may see the fitness of virtue, and deduce from thence a speculative morality. They only say that it is incompetent to spiritual discernment. But though they believe the two Spirits to be thus distinct in their powers, they believe them, I apprehend, to be so far connected in religion, that the Spirit of God can only act upon a reasonable being. Thus light, and the power of sight, are distinct things. Yet the power of sight is nothing without light, nor can light operate upon any other organ than the eye to produce vision.

This proposition may be further elucidated by making a comparison between the powers of men and those of the brute creation. An animal is compounded of body and instinct. If we were to endeavor to cultivate this instinct, we might make the animal tame and obe-

dient. We might impress his sensitive powers, so that he might stop or go forward at our voice. We might bring him in some instances to an imitation of outward gestures or sounds. But all the years of his life, and centuries of life in his progeny, would pass away, and we should never be able so to improve his instinct into intellect, as to make him comprehend the affairs of a man. He would never understand the meaning of his goings in, or of his goings out, or of his pursuits in life, or of his progress in science. So neither could any education, it is believed, so improve the reason of man into the divine principle of Light within him, as that he should understand spiritual things; for the things of God are only discernible by the spirit of God.

This doctrine that there is no understanding of divine things, except through the medium of the divine principle, which dwells in the temple of man, was no particular notion of George Fox, or of the succeeding Quakers, though undoubtedly they have founded more upon it than other Christians. They, who had the earliest access to the writings of the evangelists and apostles, believed the proposition. All the ancient fathers of the church considered it as the corner-stone of the Christian fabric. The most celebrated of the Reformers held it in the same light. The divines, who followed these adopted it as their creed also; and by these it has been handed down to other Christian communities, and is retained as an essential doctrine by the church of England at the present day.

The Quakers adduce many authorities in behalf of this proposition; but the following may suffice:

"It is the inward master," says St. Augustine, "that teacheth. Where this inspiration is wanting, it is in vain that words from without are beaten in."

Luther says, "No man can rightly know God, unless he immediately receive it from his Holy Spirit; unless he find it by experience in himself: and in this experience the Holy Spirit teacheth, as in his proper school; out of which School nothing is taught but mere talk."

Calvin, on Luke x. 21, says, "Here the natural wisdom of man is so puzzled, and is at such a loss, that the first step of profiting in the school of Christ is to give it up or renounce it. For by this natural wisdon, as by a veil before our eyes, we are hindered from attaining the mysteries of God, which are not revealed but unto babes and little ones. For neither do flesh and blood reveal, nor doth the natural man perceive, the things that are of the spirit. But the doctrine of God is rather foolishness to him, because it can only be spiritually judged. The assistance therefore of the Holy Spirit is in this case necessary; or, rather, his power alone is efficacious."

Dr. Smith observes, in his select discourses, "Besides the outward revelations of God's will to man, there is also an inward impression of it in their minds and spirits, which is in a more especial manner attributed to God. We cannot see divine things but in a divine light. God only, who is the true Light, and in whom there is no darkness at all, can so shine out of himself upon our glassy understandings, as to beget in them a picture of himself, his own will and pleasure, and turn the soul (as the phrase is in Job) like wax or clay to the seal of his own light and love. He, that made our souls in his own image and likeness, can easily find a way into them. The word, that God speaks, having found a way into the soul, imprints itself there as with the point of a diamond, and becomes (to borrow Plato's expression) 'a word written in the soul of the learner.' Men may teach the grammar and the rhetoric, but god teaches the divinity. Thus, it is God alone that acquaints the soul with the truths of revelation."

The learned Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down and Connor, speaks in a similiar manner in his sermon de Via Intelligentiæ. "Now in this inquiry," says he, "I must take one thing for granted, which is, that every good man is taught of God. And indeed, unless he teach us, we shall make but ill scholars ourselves, and worse guides to others. No man can know God, says Irenæus, except he be taught of God. If God teaches us, then all is well: but if we do not learn wisdom at his feet, from whence should we have it? It can come from no other spring."

Again: "Those, who perfect holiness in the fear of God, have a degree of divine knowledge, more than we can discourse of, and more certain than the demonstrations of geometry, brighter than the sun, and indeficient as the light of Heaven.—A good man is united to God. As flame touches flame, and combines into splendor and into glory, so is the spirit of a man united to Christ by the Spirit of God. —Our light, on the other hand, is like a candle. Every wind of doctrine blows it out, or expends the wax, and makes the light tremulous. But the lights of Heaven are fixed, and bright, and shine for ever."

Cudworth, in his Intellectual System, is wholly of the same opinion. "All the books and writings which we converse with, they can but represent spiritual objects to our understandings, which yet we can never see in their own true figure, color, and proportion, until we have a divine light within to irradiate and shine upon them. Though there be never such excellent truths concerning Christ and His Gospel set down in words and letters, yet they will be but unknown characters to us, until we have a living Spirit within us,

that can decypher them; until the same Spirit, by secret whispers in our hearts, do comment upon them, which did at first indite them. There be many that understand the Greek and Hebrew of the Scripture, the original languages in which the text was written, that never understood the language of the Spirit."

CHAPTER III.

Neither can a man, unless he has a portion of the same Spirit, which Jesus and the apostles and the prophets had, know spiritually that the Scriptures are of divine authority, or spiritually understand them—Explanation of these tenets—Objection that these tenets set aside human reason—Reply of the Quakers—Observations of Luther—Calvin—Owen—Archbishop Usher—Archbishop Sandys—Milton—Bishop Taylor.

As a man cannot know spiritual things but through the medium of the Spirit of God, or unless he has a portion of the same Spirit, which Jesus and the prophets and the apostles had; so neither can he, unless he has a portion of the same Spirit, either spiritually know that the writings or sayings of these holy persons are of divine authority, or read or understand them to the promotion of his spiritual interest.

These two tenets are but deductions from that in the former chapter, and may be thus explained:

A man, the Quakers say, may examine the Holy Scriptures, and may deduce their divine origin from the prophecies they contain, of which many have been since accomplished; from the superiority of their doctrines beyond those in any other book which is the work of man; from the miraculous preservation of them for so many ages; from the harmony of all their parts; and from many other circumstances, which might be mentioned. But this, after all, will be but an historical, literal, or outward proof of their origin, resulting from his reason or his judgment. It will be no spiritual proof, having a spiritual influence on his heart; for this proof of the divine origin of the Scriptures can only be had from the Spirit of God. Thus, when the apostle Paul* preached to several women by the river-side near Philippi, it is said of Lydia only, "The Lord opened her heart that she attended to the things that were spoken by Paul." The other women undoubtedly heard the Gospel of Paul with their outward ears: but it does not appear that their hearts were in such a spiritual state that they felt its divine authority; for it is not said of

---

* Acts xvi. 13.

them as of Lydia, that their hearts were opened to understand spiritually that this Gospel was of God. Again, when Jesus Christ preached to the Jews in the temple*, many believed on him; but others believed not, but were so enraged that they took up stones to cast at him. It appears that they all with their outward ears heard his doctrine, in which he particularly stated that he was from above; but they did not receive the truth of his origin in their hearts, because they were not in a state to receive that faith, which cometh from the Spirit of God. In the same manner persons may hear sermon after sermon at the present day, but find no spiritual benefit on their hearts.

Again: A man by comparing passages of Scripture with other passages, and by considering the use and acceptation of words in these, may arrive at a knowledge of their literal meaning. He may obtain also, by perusing the Scriptures, a knowledge of some of the attributes of God. He may discover a part of the plan of his providence. He may collect purer moral truths than from any other source. But no literal reading of the Scriptures can give him that spiritual knowledge of divine things, which leads to eternal life. The Scriptures, if literally read, will give him a literal or corresponding knowledge: but it is only the Spiritual Monitor within, who can apply them to his feelings; who can tell him, "Thou art the man. This is thy state. This is that which thou oughtest or oughtest not to have done;" so that he sees spiritually (the Spirit of God bearing witness with his own spirit) that his own situation has been described. Indeed, if the Scriptures were sufficient of themselves for this latter purpose, the Quakers say that the knowledge of spiritual things would consist in the knowledge of words. They, who were to get the most of the Divine writings by heart, would know spiritually the most of divine truths. The man of the best understanding, or of the most cultivated mind, would be the best proficient in vital religion. But this is contrary to fact. For men of deep learning know frequently less of spiritual Christianity than those of the poor, who are scarcely able to read the Scriptures. They contend also, that if the Scriptures were the most vitally understood by those of the most learning, then the dispensations of God would be partial, inasmuch as he would have excluded the poor from the highest enjoyment of which the nature of man is susceptible, and from the means of their eternal salvation.

These tenets, which are thus adopted by the Quakers, are considered by many of the moderns as objectionable, in as much as they make

---

*John viii. 30, 45, 49.

reason, at least in theology, a useless gift. The Quakers, however, contend, that they consider reason as one of the inestimable gifts of God. They value it highly in its proper province. They do not exclude it from religion. Men, by means of it, may correct literal errors in the Scriptures; may restore texts; may refute doctrines inconsistent with the attributes of the Almighty. The apology of Robert Barclay, which is a chain of reasoning of this kind from the beginning to the end, is a proof that they do not undervalue the powers of the mind. But they dare not ascribe to human reason that power, which they believe to be exclusively vested in the Spirit of God.

They say, moreover, that these tenets are neither new, nor peculiar to themselves as a Society. They were the doctrines of the primitive fathers. They were the doctrines also of the Protestant Reformers. And though many at the present day consider that scripture, interpreted by reason, is the religion of Protestants, yet it was the general belief of these reformers, that the teaching of the Holy Spirit was necessary to the spiritual understanding of the Scriptures as well as to the spiritual establishment of their divine origin.

Luther observes, "It is not human reason or wisdom, nor the law of God, but the work of Divine Grace freely bestowed upon me, that teacheth me and showeth me the Gospel. And this gift of God I receive by Faith alone.

"The Scriptures are not to be understood but by the same spirit by which they written.

"No man sees one jot or title in the Scriptures, unless he has the Spirit of God.

"Profane men," says Calvin, "desire to have it proved to them by reason, that Moses and the prophets spake from God. And to such I answer, that the testimony of the spirit exceeds all reason. For as God alone is a sufficient witness for himself in his Word, so will his word not find credit in the hearts of men, until it is sealed by the inward testimony of his Spirit. It is therefore necessary that the same Spirit, which spake by the mouth of the prophets, enter into our hearts, to persuade us that they faithfully declared what was commanded them by God.

"Again: Unless we have this assurance, which is better and more valid than any judgment of man, it will be in vain to go about to establish the authority of Scripture, either by arguments or the consent of the Church: for, unless this foundation be laid, namely, that the certainty of its divine authority depends entirely upon the testimony of the Spirit, it remains in perpetual suspense.

"Again: The Spirit of God, from whom the doctrine of the Gospel proceeds, is the only true interpreter to open it to us."

"Divines," says the learned Owen, "at the first reformation, did generally resolve our faith of the divine authority of the Scriptures into the testimony of the Holy Spirit;" in which belief he joins himself by stating, that "it is the work of the Holy Spirit to enable us to believe the Scriptures to be the work of God."

In another place he says, "Our divines have long since laid it down, that the only public, authentic, and infallible interpreter of the holy Scriptures is the Author of them, from whose inspiration they receive all their truth, clearness and authority. This author is the Holy Spirit."

Archbishop Sandys, in one of his Sermons preached before Queen Elizabeth, has the following observations:

"The outward reading of the Word, without the inward working of the Spirit, is nothing. The precise Pharisees, and the learned Scribes, read the Scriptures over and over again. They not only read them in books, but wore them on their garments. They were not only taught, but were able themselves to teach others. But because this heavenly Teacher had not instructed them, their understanding was darkened, and their knowledge was but vanity. They were ignorant altogether in that saving truth, which the prophet David was so desirous to learn. The mysteries of Salvation were so hard to be conceived by the very apostles of Christ Jesus, that he was forced many times to rebuke them for their dullness; which unless he had removed, by opening the eyes of their mind, they could never have attained to the knowledge of Salvation in Christ Jesus. The ears of that woman Lydia would have been as close shut against the preaching of Paul as any others, if the finger of God had not touched and opened her heart. As many as learn, they are taught of God.

Archbishop Usher, in his Sum and Substance of the Christian religion, observes, "that it is required that we have the Spirit of God, as well to open our eyes to see the light, as to seal up fully in our hearts that truth, which we see with our eyes. For the same Holy Spirit, that inspired the Scripture, inclineth the hearts of God's children to believe what is revealed in them; and inwardly assureth them, above all reasons and arguments, that these are the Scriptures of God." And further on in the same work he says, "The Spirit of God alone is the certain interpreter of His Word written by His Spirit; for no man knoweth the things pertaining to God but the Spirit of God."

Our great Milton also gives us a similar opinion in the following words, which are taken from his Paradise Lost:

"——But in their room—
Wolves shall succeed for teachers, grievous wolves,

Who all the sacred mysteries of Heaven
To their own vile advantages shall turn
Of lucre and ambition, and the truth
With superstitions and traditions taint,
Left only in those written records pure,
Though *not but by the Spirit understood.*"

Of the same mind was the learned bishop Taylor, as we collect from his sermon De Via Intelligentiæ. "For although the Scriptures," says he, "are written by the Spirit of God, yet they are written within and without. And besides the Light, that shines upon the face of them, unless there be a Light shining within our hearts, unfolding the leaves, and interpreting the mysterious sense of the Spirit, convincing our consciences, and preaching to our hearts; to look for Christ in the leaves of the Gospel is to look for the living among the dead. There is a life in them; but that life is," according to St. Paul's expression, "hid with Christ in God; and unless the Spirit of God first draw it, we shall never draw it forth."

Again. "Human learning brings excellent ministeries towards this. It is admirably useful for the reproof of heresies, for the detection of fallacies, for the letter of the Scripture, for collateral testimonies, for exterior advantages: but there is something beyond this, that human learning, without the addition of divine, can never reach. Moses was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians, and the holy men of God contemplated the glories of God in the admirable order, motion, and influences of the heavens; but, besides all this, they were taught something far beyond these prettinesses. Pythagoras read Moses's books, and so did Plato; and yet they became not proselytes of the religion, though they were the learned scholars of such a master."

CHAPTER IV.

The Spirit of God, which has been thus given to man in different degrees, was given to him as a spiritual teacher or guide in his spiritual concerns—It performs this office, the Quakers say, by internal monitions—Sentiments of Taylor—and of Monro—and, if encouraged, it teaches even by the external objects of the Creation—William Wordsworth.

The members of this Society believe that the Spirit of God, which has been thus given to man in different degrees or measures, and without which it is impossible to know spiritual things, or even to understand the Divine Writings spiritually, or to be assured of their

divine origin, was given to him, among other purposes, as a teacher of good and evil, or to serve him as a guide in his spiritual concerns. By this they mean, that if any man will give himself up to the directions of the spiritual principle that resides within him, he will attain a knowledge sufficient to enable him to discover the path of his duty both to God and his fellow-man.

That the Spirit of God was given to man as a spirtual instructor, the Quakers conceive to be plain from a number of passages, which are to be found in the Sacred Writings.

They say, in the first place, that this was the language of the holy men of old*. "I said," says Elihu, "days should speak, and multitudes of years should teach wisdom. But there is a spirit (or the Spirit itself is) in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." The Levites are found also making an acknowledgment to God†, that "he gave also their fore-fathers his good Spirit to instruct them." The Psalms of David are also full of the same language, such as of "‡Show me thy ways, O Lord; lead me in the truth." "I know," says Jeremiah §, "that the way of man is not in himself. It is not in man, that walketh, to direct his steps." The martyr Stephen acknowledges the teachings of the Spirit, both in his own time and in that of his ancestors. "‖ Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit. As your fathers did, so do ye." The Quakers also concieve it to be a doctrine of the Gospel. Jesus himself said **, "No man can come to me except the father which has sent me, draw him—It is written in the prophets, They shall all be taught of God." St. John‡‡ says, "That was the true light (namely, the Word or Spirit) which lighteth every man that cometh into the world:" St. Paul also, in his first letter to the Corinthians, asserts ‡‡ that the "manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withall;" and in his letter to Titus he asserts the same thing §§, though in different words: "for the Grace of God," says he, "which bringeth Salvation hath appeared unto all men."

The Spirit of God, which has thus been given to man as a spiritual guide, is considered by the Quakers as teaching him in various ways. It inspires him with good thoughts. It prompts him to good offices. It checks him in his way to evil. It reproves him while in the act of committing it.

The learned Jeremy Taylor was of the same opinion. "The Spirit of Grace," says he, "is the Spirit of Wisdom, and teaches us

---

* Job xxxii. 7. † Nehemiah ix. 20. ‡ Psalm xxv. 4. § Jeremiah x. 23.
‖ Acts vii. 51. ** John vi. 44, 45. †† John i. 9. ‡‡ 1 Cor. xii. 7. §§ Titus ii. 11.

by secret inspiration, by proper arguments, by actual persuasions, by personal application, by effects and energies."

The office of the Spirit is also beautifully described by Monro, a divine of the established church, in his Just Measures of the Pious Institutions of Youth. "The Holy Spirit," says he, speaks inwardly and immediately to the soul. For God is a Spirit. The soul is a spirit, and they converse with one another in the Spirit, not by words, but by spiritual notices, which, however, are more intelligible than the most eloquent strains in the world. God makes himself to be heard by the soul by inward motions, which it perceives and comprehends proportionably as it is voided and emptied of earthly ideas. And the more the faculties of the soul cease their own operations, so much the more sensible and intelligible are the motions of God to it. These immediate communications of God with the souls of men, are denied and derided by a great many. But that the Father of Spirits should have no converse with our spirits but by the intervention only of outward and foreign objects, may justly seem strange, especially when we are so often told in Holy Scriptures, that we are the temples of the Holy Ghost, and that God dwelleth in all good men."

But this Spirit is considered by the Society, not only as teaching by inward breathings as it were, made immediately and directly upon the heart, without the intervention of outward circumstances, but as making the material objects of the universe, and many of the occurrences of life, if it be properly attended to, subservient to the instruction of man; and as enlarging the sphere of his instruction in this manner in proportion as it is received and encouraged. Thus, the man, who is attentive to these divine notices, sees the animal, the vegetable, and the planetary world with spiritual eyes. He cannot stir abroad, but he is taught in his own feelings, without any motion of his will, some lesson for his spiritual advantage; or he perceives so vitally some of the attributes of the Divine Being, that he is called upon to offer some spiritual incense to his Maker. If the lamb frolics and gambols in his presence as he walks along, he may be made spiritually to see the beauty and happiness of innocence. If he finds the stately oak laid prostrate by the wind, he may be spiritually taught to discern the emptiness of human power; while the same spirit may teach him inwardly the advantage of humility, when he looks at the little hawthorn, which has survived the storm. When he sees the change and fall of the autumnal leaf, he may be spiritually admonished of his own change and dissolution, and of the necessity of a holy life. Thus, the Spirit of God may teach men by outward objects and occurrences in the world. But

where this Spirit is away, or rather where it is not attended to, no such lesson can be taught. Natural objects of themselves can excite only natural ideas; and the natural man, looking at them, can derive only natural pleasure or draw natural conclusions from them. In looking at the sun he may be pleased with its warmth, and anticipate its advantage to the vegetable world. In plucking and examining a flower, he may be struck with its beauty, its mechanism, and its fragrant smell. In observing the butterfly, as it wings its way before him, he may smile at its short journeys from place to place, and admire the splendor upon its wings. But the beauty of creation is dead to him, as far as it depends upon connecting it spiritually with the character of God; for no spiritual impression can arise from any natural objects, so that these should be sanctified to him, but through the intervention of the Spirit of God.

William Wordsworth, in his instructive Poems, has described this teaching by external objects in consequence of impressions from a higher power, as differing from any teaching by books or by the human understanding, and as arising without any motion of the will of man, in so beautiful and simple a manner, that I cannot do otherwise than make an extract from them in this place. Lively as the poem is, to which I allude, I conceive it will not lower the dignity of the subject. It is called "Expostulation and Reply*," and is as follows:

"Why William, on that old gray stone,
Thus for the length of half a day—
Why, William, sit you thus alone,
And dream your time away?

"Where are your books? that light bequeath'd
To beings else forlorn and blind!
Up! Up! and drink the Spirit breath'd
From dead men to their kind.

"You look round to your mother Earth,
As if she for no purpose bore you,
As if you were her first-born birth,
And none had lived before you!"

"One morning thus by Esthwaite Lake,
When life was sweet, I knew not why,
To me my good Friend Matthew spake,
And thus I made reply:—

*See Lyrical Ballads, vol. i. p. 1.

"The eye it cannot choose but see,
We cannot bid the ear be still;
Our bodies feel, where'er they be,
Against or with our will.

"Nor less I deem that there are Powers,
Which of themselves our minds impress,
That we can feed this mind of ours
In a wise passiveness.

"Think you, mid all this mighty sum
Of things for ever speaking,
That nothing of itself will come,
But we must still be seeking?

"Then ask not wherefore here alone,
Conversing as I may,
I sit upon this old gray stone,
And dream my time away?"

CHAPTER V.

This Spirit was not only given to man as a teacher, but as a primary and infallible guide—Hence the Scriptures are a subordinate or a secondary guide—Quakers, however, do not undervalue them on this account—Their opinion concerning them.

The Spirit of God, which we have seen to be thus given to men as a spiritual teacher, and to act in the ways described, the Quakers usually distinguish by the epithets of Primary and Infallible. But they have made another distinction with respect to the character of this Spirit; for they have pronounced it to be the only infallible guide to men in their spiritual concerns. From this latter declaration the reader will naturally conclude, that the Scriptures, which are the outward teachers of men, must be viewed by the Society in a secondary light. This conclusion has indeed been adopted as a proposition in the Quaker-theology; or, in other words, it is a doctrine of the Society, That the spirit of God is the primary and only infallible, and the Scriptures but a subordinate or secondary, guide.

This proposition the Quakers usually make out in the following manner:

It is, in the first place, admitted by all Christians, that the Scriptures were given by inspiration; or that those, who originally wrote or delivered the several parts of them, gave them forth by means of

that Spirit, which was given to them by God. Now in the same manner as streams or rivulets of water are subordinate to the fountains which produce them, so these streams or rivulets of light must be subordinate to the Great Light from whence they originally sprung. "We cannot," says Barclay, "call the Scriptures the principal fountain of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the first adequate rule of faith and manners, because the principal fountain of truth must be the Truth itself; that is, that, whose certainty and authority depend not upon another."

The Scriptures are subordinate or secondary, again, in other points of view. First, because, though they are placed before us, we can only know or understand them, as has been before shown, by the testimony of the Spirit. Secondly, because there is no virtue or power in them of themselves, but in the Spirit from whence they came.

They are, again, but a secondary guide; "because that," says Barclay, "cannot be the only and principal guide, which doth not universally reach every individual that needeth it." But the Scriptures do not reach deaf persons, nor children, nor idiots, nor an immense number of people, more than half the globe, who never yet saw or heard of them. These, therefore, if they are to be saved like others, must have a different or a more general rule to guide them, or be taught from another source.

They are only a secondary guide, again, for another reason. It is an acknowledged axiom among Christians, that the Spirit of God is a perfect Spirit, and that it can never err. But the Scriptures are neither perfect of themselves as a collection, nor are they perfect in their verbal parts. Many of them have been lost. Concerning those, which have survived, there have been great disputes. Certain parts of these, which one Christian council received in the early times of the church, were rejected as not canonical by another. "Now, what," says Barclay, "would become of Christians, if they had not received that Spirit, and those spiritual senses, by which they know how to discover the true from the false? It is the privilege of Christ's sheep, indeed, that they hear his voice, and refuse that of the stranger; which privilege being taken away, we are left a prey to all manner of wolves." The Scriptures, therefore, in consequence of the state in which they have come down to us, cannot, the Quakers say, be considered to be a guide as entirely perfect as the internal testimony of their great Author, the Spirit of God.

But though the members of this Society have thought it right, in submitting their religious creed to the world on this subject, to be so guarded in the wording of it as to make the distinction described, they are far from undervaluing the Scriptures on that account. They

believe, on the other hand, whatever mutilations they may have suffered, they contain sufficient to guide men in belief and practice; and that all internal emotions, which are contrary to the declaration of these, are wholly inadmissible. "Moreover," says Barclay, "because the Scriptures are commonly acknowledged by all to have been written by the dictates of the Holy Spirit, and that the errors, which may be supposed by the injury of time to have slipt in, are not such but that there is a sufficiently clear testimony left to all the essentials of the Christian faith, we do look upon them as the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians, and that whatsoever doctrine is contrary to their testimony may therefore justly be rejected as false."

The Quakers believe also, that as God gave a portion of his Spirit to man to assist him inwardly, so he gave the Holy Scriptures to assist him outwardly, in his spiritual concerns. Hence the latter, coming by inspiration, are the most precious of all the books that ever were written, and the best outward guide: and hence the things contained in them ought to be read, and, as far as possible, fulfilled.

They believe, with the apostle Paul, that the Scriptures are highly useful; so that "through patience and comfort of them they may have hope; and also that they are profitable for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness:" that in the same manner as land, highly prepared and dressed by the husbandman, becomes fit for the reception and for the promotion of the growth of the seed that is to be placed in it, so the Scriptures turn the attention of man towards God, and by means of the exortations, reproofs, promises, and threatenings, contained in them, prepare the mind for the reception and growth of the seed of the Holy Spirit.

They believe, again, that the same Scriptures show more of the particulars of God's will with respect to man, and of the scheme of the Gospel-dispensation, than any ordinary portion of his Spirit, as usually given to man, would have enabled him to discover. They discover that the "* wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ;" that "† Jesus Christ was set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;" that "‡ he tasted death for every man;" that he was "§ delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification;" that "‖ he is set down at the right-hand of the throne of God;" "** and ever liveth to make intercession for us;" and that he is the substance

* Rom. vi. 23. † Rom. iii. 25. ‡ Heb. ii. 9. § Rom. iv. 25.
‖ Heb. xii. 2. ** Heb. vii. 25.

of all the types and figures under the Levitical priesthood *, being the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

They believe, again, that in consequence of these various revelations, as contained in the Scriptures, they have inestimable advantages over the Heathen nations, or over those, where the Gospel-sun has never yet shone; and that as their advantages are greater, so more will be required of them, or their condemnation will be greater if they fail to attend to those things, which are clearly revealed.

They maintain, again, that their discipline is founded on the rules of the gospel; and that in consequence of giving an interpretation different from that of many others to some of the expressions of Jesus Christ, by which they conceive they make his kingdom more pure and heavenly, they undergo persecutions from the world; so that they confirm their attachment to the Scriptures by the best of all credible testimonies—the seal of their own sufferings.

CHAPTER VI.

This Spirit of God which has been thus given to men as an infallible guide in their spiritual concerns, has been given them universally—to the patriarchs and Israelites from the creation to the time of Moses—to the Israelites or Jews from Moses to Jesus Christ—to the Gentile-world from all antiquity to modern times—to all those who have ever heard the Gospel—and it continues its office to the latter even at the present day.

The Quakers are of opinion, that the Spirit of God, of which a portion has been given to men as a primary and infallible guide in their spiritual concerns, has been given them universally, or has been given to all of the human race, without any exception, for the same purpose.

This proposition of the Society I shall divide, in order that the reader may see it more clearly, into four cases. The first of these will comprehend the patriarchs and the Israelites from the creation to the time of Moses. The second, the Israelites or Jews from the time of Moses to the coming of Jesus Christ. The third, the Gentiles or Heathens. And the fourth, all those who have heard of the Gospel of Jesus Christ from the time of his own ministry to the present day.

The first case includes a portion of time of above two thousand years. Now the Quakers believe that during all this time men

---

* Rom. x. 4.

were generally enlightened as to their duty by the Spirit of God; for there was no Scripture, or written law of God, during all this period. "It was about two thousand four hundred years," says Thomas Beaven, an approved writer among the Quakers, "after the creation of the world, before mankind had any external written law for the rule and conduct of their lives, so far as appears by either sacred or profane history; in all of which time, mankind, generally speaking, had only for their rule of faith and manners the external creation as a monitor to their outward senses, for evidence of the reality and certainty of the existence of the Supreme Being, and the internal impressions God by his Divine Spirit made upon the capacities and powers of their souls or inward man, and perhaps some of them oral traditions delivered from father to son."

To the same point, Thomas Beaven quotes the ever memorable John Hales, who, in his Golden Remains, writes in the following manner: "The love and favor, which it pleased God to bear our fathers before the Law, so far prevailed with him, as that, without any books and writings, by familiar and friendly conversing with them, and communicating himself unto them, he made them receive and understand his laws; their inward conceits and intellectuals being, after a wonderful manner, figured as it were and characterized by his Spirit, so that they could not but see, and consent unto and confess the truth of them. Which way of manifesting his will, unto many other gracious privileges which it had, above that which in after ages came in place of it, had this added, that it brought with it unto the man to whom it was made, a preservation against all doubt and hesitancy, and a full assurance, both who the Author was, and how far his intent and meaning reached. We, who are their offspring, ought, as St. Chrysostom tells us, so to have demeaned ourselves, that it might have been with us as it was with them; that we might have had no need of writing, no other teacher but the Spirit, no other books but our hearts, no other means to have been taught the things of God."

That the Spirit of God, as described by Thomas Beaven and the venerable John Hales, was the great instructor or enlightener of men during the period we are speaking of, the Quakers believe from what they conceive to be the sense of the holy Scriptures on this subject. For in the first place, they consider it as a position deducible from the expressions of Moses, that the *"Spirit of God had striven" with those of the antediluvian world. They believe, therefore, that it was this Spirit (and because the means were adequate,

* Genesis vi. 3.

and none more satisfactory to them can be assigned) which informed Cain, before any written Law existed, and this even before the murder of his brother, that *"if he did well he should be accepted; but, if not, sin should lie at his door." The same Spirit they conceive to have illuminated the mind of Seth, but in a higher degree than ordinarily the mind of Enoch, for he is the first, of whom it is recorded that "he walked with God†." It is also considered by the members of this Society as having afforded a rule of conduct to those, who lived after the Flood. Thus Joseph is described as saying, when there is no record of any verbal instruction from the Almighty on this subject, and at a time when there was no Scripture or written Law of God, "How then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God‡?" It illuminated others also, but in a greater or less degree, as before. Thus Noah became a preacher of righteousness. Thus Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were favored with a greater measure of it than others, who lived in their own times.

From these times to the coming of Jesus Christ, which is the second of the cases in question, the same Spirit, according to the Society, still continued its teachings, and this, notwithstanding the introduction of the Mosaic Law. For this law, which was engraved on tables of stone, did not set aside the law, that was engraven on the heart. It assisted first, outwardly, in turning men's minds to God; and secondly, in fitting them, as a schoolmaster, for attention to the internal impressions by his Spirit. That the Spirit of God was still the great teacher, the Quakers conceive to be plain, for the sacred writings from Moses to Malachi affirm it for a part of the period now assigned; and for the rest, they offer as evidence, the reproof of the martyr Stephen, and the sentences from the New Testament, quoted in the last chapter but one. And in the same manner as this Spirit had been given to some in a greater measure than to others, both before and after the Deluge, so they believe it to have been given more abundantly to Moses and the Prophets than to others of the same nation; for they believe that the Law in particular, and that the general writings of Moses and those of the Prophets also, were of divine inspiration, or the productions of the Spirit of God.

With respect to the Heathens or Gentiles, which is the third case, they believe that God's Holy Spirit became a guide also to them, and furnished them, as it had done the Patriarchs and Jews, with a rule of practice. For even these, who had none of the advantages of

---

* Genesis iv. 7. † Gen. v. 24.

‡ Genesis xxxix. 9.—The traditionary Laws of Noah were in force at this time, but they only specified three offences between man and man.

Scripture or of a written divine Law, believed, many of them, in God; such as Orpheus, Hesiod, Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Cicero, and others. And of these it may be observed, that it was their general belief, as well as it was the belief of many others in those days, that there was a divine Light or Spirit in man, to enable him to direct himself aright.

Among the remnants that have been preserved of the sayings of Pythagoras, are the following, which relate to this subject: "Those things, which are agreeable to God, cannot be known, except a man hear God himself."—Again: "But, having overcome these things, thou shalt know the cohabitation or dwelling together of the immortal God and mortal men. This work is Life. The work of God is Immortality and Life."

"The most excellent thing," says Timæus, "that the soul is awakened to, is her Guide or good Genius; but if she be rebellious to it, it will prove her Dæmon or Tormentor."

"It was frequently said of Socrates, that he had the Guide of his life within him, which it was told his father Sophroniscus, would be of more worth to him than five hundred masters. He called it his good angel or spirit; that it suggested to his mind what was good and virtuous, and inclined and disposed him to a strict and pious life; that it furnished him with divine knowledge, and impelled him very often to speak publicly to the people, sometimes in a way of severe reproof, at other times to information."

"Plato says, "The Light and Spirit of God are as wings to the soul, or as that which raiseth up the soul into a sensible communion with God above the world."

"I have," says Seneca, "a more clear and certain Light, by which I may judge the truth from falsehood. That, which belongs to the happiness of the soul, the Eternal Mind will direct to." Again: "It is a foolish thing for thee to wish for that which thou canst not obtain. God is near thee, and he is in thee. The good Spirit sits or resides within us, the observer of our good and evil actions. As he is dealt with by us, he dealeth with us."

The Quakers produce these, and a multitude of other quotations, which it is not necessary to repeat, to show that the same Spirit, which taught the Patriarchs before the Law, and the Jews after it, taught the Gentiles also. But this revelation by the Spirit was not confined, in their opinion, to the Roman or Greek philosophers, or to those, who had greater pretensions than common to human wisdom. They believe that, in consequence of the manifestation of it, no nation was ever discovered, among those of antiquity, to have been so wild or ignorant, as not to have acknowledged a Divinity, or as

not to have known and established a difference between good and evil.

Cicero says, "There is no country so barbarous, no one of all men so savage, as that some apprehension of the Gods hath not tinctured his mind. That many indeed," says he, "think corruptly of them must be admitted; but this is the effect of vicious custom. For all do believe that there is a Divine Power and Nature."

Maximus Tyriensis, a Platonic philosopher, and a man of considerable knowledge, observes, that, "notwithstanding the great contention and variety of opinions, which have existed concerning the nature and essence of God, yet the law and reason of every country are harmonious in these respects; namely, that there is one God, the King and Father of all; and that the many are but the servants and co-rulers unto God; that in this the Greek and the barbarian, the islander and the inhabitant of the continent, the wise and the foolish, speak the same language. "Go," says he, "to the utmost bounds of the ocean, and you find God there. But if there have been," says he, "since the existence of time, two or three atheistical, vile, senseless individuals, whose eyes and ears deceive them, and who are maimed in their very soul, an irrational and barren species, as monstrous as a lion without courage, an ox without horns, or a bird without wings,—yet out of these you will be able to understand something of God. For they know and confess him, whether they will or not."

Plutarch says, that "if a man were to travel through the world, he might possibly find cities without walls, without letters, without kings, without wealth, without schools, and without theatres. But a city without a temple, or that useth no worship, or no prayers, no one ever saw. And he believes a city may more easily be built without a foundation, or ground to set it on, than a community of men have or keep a consistency without religion."

Of those nations, which were reputed wild and ignorant in ancient times, the Scythians may be brought, next to the Greeks and Romans, as an instance to elucidate the opinions of the Quakers still further on this subject. The speech of the Scythian ambassadors to Alexander the Great, as handed down to us by Quintus Curtius, has been often cited by writers, not only on account of its beauty and simplicity, but to show us the moral sentiments of the Scythians in those times. I shall make a few extracts from it on this occasion.

"Had the Gods given thee," says one of the ambassadors to Alexander, "a body proportionable to thy ambition, the whole universe would have been too little for thee. With one hand thou wouldest touch the East, and with the other the West; and not satisfied with this, thou wouldest follow the sun, and know where he hides himself.

"But what have we to do with thee? We never set foot in thy country. May not those, who inhabit woods, be allowed to live without knowing who thou art and whence thou comest? We will neither command over, nor submit to any man.

"But thou, who boastest thy coming to extirpate robbers, thou thyself art the greatest robber upon earth.

"Thou hast possessed thyself of Lydia, invaded Syria, Persia, and Bactriana. Thou art forming a design to march as far as India; and thou now comest hither, to seize upon our herds of cattle. The great possessions thou hast, only make thee covet more eagerly what thou hast not.

"We are informed that the Greeks speak jestingly of our Scythian deserts, and that they are even become a proverb; but we are fonder of our solitudes than of thy great cities.

"If thou art a God, thou oughtest to do good to mortals, and not to deprive them of their possessions. If thou art a mere man, reflect on what thou art.

"Do not fancy that the Scythians will take an oath in their concluding of an alliance with thee. The only oath among them is to keep their word, without swearing. Such cautions as these do indeed become Greeks, who sign their treaties, and call upon the Gods to witness them. But, with regard to us, our religion consists in being sincere, and in keeping the promises we have made. That man, who is not ashamed to break his word with men, is not ashamed of deceiving the Gods."

To the account contained in these extracts, it may be added, that the Scythians are described by Herodotus, Justin, Horace, and others, as a moral people. They had the character of maintaining justice. Theft or robbery was severely punished among them. They believed infidelity, after the marriage-engagement, to be deserving of death. They coveted neither silver nor gold. They refused to give the name of goods or riches to any but estimable things, such as health, courage, liberty, sincerity, innocence, and the like. They received friends as relations, or considered friendship as so sacred an alliance, that it differed but little from alliance by blood.

These principles of the Scythians, as far as they are well founded, the Quakers believe to have originated in their more than ordinary attention to that Divine Principle, which was given to them, equally with the rest of mankind, for their instruction in moral good; to that same Principle, which Socrates describes as having suggested to his mind that which was good and virtuous, or which Seneca describes to reside in men, as an observer of good and evil. For the

Scythians, living in solitary and desert places, had but little communication for many ages with the rest of mankind, and did not obtain their system of morality from other quarters. From the Greeks and Romans, who were the most enlightened, they derived no moral benefit. For Strabo informs us, that their morals had been wholly corrupted in his time, and that this wretched change had taken place in consequence of their intercourse with these nations. That they had no Scripture or written Law of God, is equally evident. Neither did they collect their morality from the perusal or observance of any particular laws, that had been left them by their ancestors; for the same author, who gives them the high character just mentioned, says that they were found in the practice of justice "not on account of any laws, but on account of their own natural genius or disposition*." Neither were they found in this practice because they had exerted their reason in discovering that virtue was so much more desirable than vice; for the same author declares that Nature, and not Reason, had made them a moral people: for "it seems surprising," says he, "that Nature should have given to them what the Greeks have never been able to attain, either in consequence of the long succession of doctrines of their wise men, or of the precepts of their philosophers, and that the manners of a barbarous should be preferable to those of a refined people†."

This opinion, that the Spirit of God was afforded as a Light to lighten the Gentiles of the ancient world, the Quakers derive from the authorities which I have now mentioned, that is, from the evidence which history has afforded, or from the sentiments which the Gentiles have discovered themselves, upon this subject; sentiments, which they could only have gathered in a manner agreeable to the constitution of their nature, or from the same source, from which it has been shown that others gathered similar knowledge, before the promulgation of any written law. But they conceive that the question is put out of all doubt by these remarkable words of the apostle Paul: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the Law, do by nature the things contained in the Law, these, having not the Law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the Law written on their hearts; their conscience also hearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another‡." And here it may be observed, that the Quakers believe

* Justitia gentis ingeniis culta, non legibus.

† Prorsus ut admirabile videatur, hoc illis Naturam dare, quod Græci longa sapientium doctrina præceptisque philosophorum consequi nequeunt, cultosque mores incultæ barbariæ collatione superari.

‡ Rom. ii. 14, 15. Macknight, in commenting upon this passage, has the fol-

also, that in the same manner as the Spirit of God enlightened the different Gentile-Nations previous to the time of the apostle, so it continues to enlighten those, who have been discovered since; for no nation has been found so ignorant, as not to make an acknowledgment of a superior Spirit, and to know the difference between good and evil. Hence it may be considered as illuminating those nations where the Scriptures have never reached, at the present day.

With respect to the last case, which includes those, who have heard with their outward ears the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Quakers believe, that the Spirit of God has continued its office of a spiritual instructor, as well to these as to any of the persons who have been described. For the Gospel is no where said to supersede, any more than the Law of Moses did, the assistance of this Spirit. On the other hand, this Spirit was deemed necessary, and this by the apostles themselves, even after churches had been established, or men had become Christians. St. Paul declares*, that whatever spiritual gifts some of his followers might then have, and however these gifts might then differ from one another, the Spirit of God was given universally to man, and this to profit withal. He declares again, that† as many as were led by this Spirit, these and these only, possessed the knowledge that was requisite to enable them to become the sons of God. And in his letter to the Thessalonians, who had become a Christian church, he gave them many particular injunctions, among which one was, that they‡ would not quench or extinguish this Spirit.

And in the same manner as this Spirit was deemed necessary in the days of the apostles, and this to every man individually, and even after he had become a Christian, so the members of this Society consider it to have been necessary since, and to continue so, wherever Christianity is professed. For many persons may read the holy Scriptures, and hear them read in churches, and yet not feel the proper conviction for sin. Here then the Quakers conceive the Spirit of God to be still necessary. It comes in with its inward monitions and reproofs, where the Scripture has been neglected or forgotten. It attempts to stay the arm of him, who is going to offend, and frequently averts the blow.

---

lowing observation out of Taylor: "Thus, in the compass of two verses, the apostle hath explained what the Light of Nature is, and demonstrated that there is such a Light existing. It is a revelation from God, written on the heart or mind of man; consequently is a revelation common to all nations; and so far as it goes, it agrees with the things written in the external revelation, which God hath made to some nations."

* 1 Cor. xii. 7. † Rom. viii. 14. ‡ 1 Thess. v. 19.

Neither is this Spirit unnecessary, even where men profess an attention to the literal precepts of the Gospel. For, in proportion as men are in the way of attending to the outward Scriptures, they are in the way of being inwardly taught by God. But without this inward teaching, no outward teaching can be effectual; for though persons may read the Scriptures, yet they cannot spiritually understand them; and though they may admire the Christian religion, yet they cannot enjoy it, according to the opinion of the Quakers, but through the medium of the Spirit of God.

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION I.

This Spirit, as it has been given universally, so it has been given sufficiently—those, who resist this Spirit, are said to quench it; and may become so hardened in time, as to be insensible of its impressions—those, who attend to it, may be said to be in the way of redemption—Similar sentiments of Munro—This visitation, treatment, and influence of the Spirit usually explained by the Quakers by the parable of the Sower.

As the Spirit of God has been thus afforded to every man since the foundation of the world to profit withal, so the Quakers say that it has been given to him in a sufficient measure for this purpose.

By the word "sufficient" we are not to understand that this Divine Monitor calls upon men every day or hour, but that it is within every man, and that it awakens him seasonably, and so often during the term of his natural life, as to exonerate God from the charge of condemning him unjustly, if he fails in his duty, and to leave himself without excuse. And in proportion as a greater or less measure of this Spirit has been afforded him, so he is more or less guilty in the sight of his Maker.

If any should resist these salutary operations of the Holy Spirit, they resist them to their own condemnation.

Of such it may be observed, that they are said to quench or grieve the Spirit, and not unfrequently to resist God, and to crucify Christ afresh; for God, and Christ, and the Spirit, are considered to be inseparably united in the Scriptures.

Of such also it may be observed, that if they continue to resist God's Holy Spirit, their feelings may become so callous or hardened in time, that they may never be able to perceive its notices again;

and thus the day as it were of their visitation may be over: for "my people," saith God, "would not hearken to my voice, and Israel would none of me; so I gave them up to their own heart's lusts, and they walked in their own counsels*." To the same import was the saying of Jesus Christ, when he wept over Jerusalem: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes†:" As if he had said, There was a day, in which ye, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, might have known those things, which belonged to your peace. I was then willing to gather you, as a hen gathereth her chickens; but, as ye would not suffer me, the things belonging to your peace are now hid from your eyes. You would not attend to the imdressions by Gods Holy Spirit, when your feelings were tender and penetrable; and therefore now, the day having passed over, ye have lost the power of discerning them

Those, on the other hand, who, during this visitation of the Holy Spirit, attend to its suggestions or warnings, are said to be in the way of redemption or salvation.

These sentiments of the Society on this subject are beautifully described by Monro in his Just measures of the pious institutions of Youth. "The Holy Spirit," says he, "solicits and importunes those, who are in a state of Sin, to return, by inward motions and impressions, by suggesting good thoughts and prompting to pious resolutions, by checks and controls, by convictions of sin and duty; sometimes by frights and terrors, and other whiles by love and endearments. But if men, notwithstanding all his loving solicitations, do still cherish and cleave to their lusts, and persevere in a state of sin, they are then said to resist the Holy Ghost; whereby their condition becomes very deplorable, and their conversion very difficult: for the more men resist the importunities, and stifle the motions, of the Holy Spirit, the stronger do the chains of their corruption and servitude become. Every new act of sin gives these a degree of strength, and consequently puts a new obstacle in the way of conversion; and when sin is turned into an inveterate and rooted habit, (which by reiterated commissions and long continuance it is) then it becomes a nature, and is with as much difficulty altered as nature is. 'Can the Ethiopian change his color, or the leopard his spots? Then may you also do good, who are accustomed to do evil.'"

"The Holy Spirit, again," says he, "inspires the prayers of those who, in consequence of his powerful operations, have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts, with devout and filial affections,

---

* Psalm lxxxi. 11, 12. † Luke xix. 42.

and makes intercession for them with sighs and groans which cannot be uttered. He guides and manages them. The sons of God are led by the Spirit of God. He makes his blessed fruits, righteousness, peace, joy and divine love, more and more to abound in them. He confirms them in goodness, persuades them to perseverance, and seals them to the day of redemption."

The Quakers usually elucidate this visitation, treatment, and influence of the Holy Spirit. by the parable of the Sower, as recorded by three of the evangelists. "Now, the Seed is the word of God." But as the ingrafted Word, which is able to save the Soul, and the Spirit, or Divine Principle in men, are the same, the parable is considered by the Quakers as relating to that divine Light or Spirit, which is given to man for his spiritual instruction and salvation. As the seed was sown in all sorts of ground, good, bad, and indifferent, so this Light or Spirit is afforded without exception to all. As thorns choked this seed, and hindered it from coming to perfection, so bad customs, or the pleasures and cares of the world, hinder men from attending to this Divine Principle within them, and render it unfruitful in their hearts. And as the seed in the good ground was not interrupted, and therefore produced fruit in abundance; so this spiritual principle, where it is not checked, but received and cherished, produces also abundance of spiritual fruit in the inward man, by putting him in the way of redemption from sin, or of holiness of life.

SECTION II.

The Spirit of God, therefore, besides it office of a Teacher, performs that of a Redeemer of men—Redemption outward and inward—the outward part of it is by the sufferings of Jesus Christ—these produce forgiveness of past sins, and put men into a capacity of salvation—inward part of it is by the operation of the Spirit—this converts men, and preserves them from sins to come—outward and inward connected with each other.

The Spirit of God which we have seen to be given to men, and to be given to them universally to enable them to distinguish between good and evil, was given them also, the Quakers believe, for another purpose; namely, to redeem or save them. Redemption and salvation in this sense are the same in the language of the Society, and mean a purification from the sins or pollutions of the world, so that a new birth may be produced and maintained in the inward man.

As the doctrine of the Quakers with respect to redemption differs from that, which generally obtains, I shall allot this chapter to an explanation of the distinction, which they themselves usually make upon this subject.

The Quakers never make use of the words Original Sin, because these are never to be found in the Sacred Writings. They consider men, however, as in a fallen or degraded state, and as inclined and liable to sin. They consider him, in short, as having the seed of sin within him, which he inherited from his parent Adam. But though they acknowledge this, they dare not say that sin is imputed to him on account of Adam's transgression, or that he is chargeable with sin until he actually commits it.

As every descendant, however, of Adam has this seed within him, which, amidst the numerous temptations that beset him, he allows some time or other to germinate, so he stands in need of a Redeemer; that is, of some power that shall be able to procure pardon for past offenses, and of some power that shall be able to preserve him in the way of holiness for the future. To expiate, himself, in a manner satisfactory to the Almighty for so foul a stain upon his nature as that of sin, is utterly beyond his abilities; for no good action that he can perform, can do away that which has been once done. And to preserve himself in a state of virtue for the future is equally out of his own power, because this cannot be done by any effort of his reason, but only by the conversion of his heart. It has therefore pleased the Almighty to find a remedy for him in each of these cases. Jesus Christ, by the sacrifice of himself, expiates for sins that are past*; and the Spirit of God, which has been afforded to him as a spiritual teacher, has the power of cleansing and purifying the heart so thoroughly, that he may be preserved from sinning for the future.

That forgiveness of past sins is procured by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is obvious from various passages in the Holy Scriptures. Thus the apostle Paul says that "Jesus Christ was set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God†." And in his Epistle to the Colossians he says, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins‡." This may be called the external part of redemption; because it has been effected by outward means, or by the outward sufferings of Jesus Christ, and it is considered as putting men, in consequence of this forgiveness, into the capacity of salvation. The Quakers, however, attribute this part of redemption wholly to the love of God.

The other part of redemption, on the other hand, is called inward, because it is considered by them to be an inward redemption from

---

* Barclay considers this sacrifice to extend to infants on account of the seed or principle of sin in them.

† Rom. iii. 25.

‡ Coloss. i. 14.

the power of sin, or a cleansing of the heart from the pollutions of the world. This inward redemption is produced by the Spirit of God, as before stated, operating on the hearts of men, and so cleansing and purifying them as to produce a new birth in the inward man; so that the same Spirit of God, which has been given to men in various degrees since the fall of Adam, as a teacher in their spiritual concerns, which hath visited every man in his day, and which hath exhorted and reproved him for his spiritual welfare*, has the power of preserving him from future sin, and of leading him to salvation.

That this inward work of redemption is performed by the Spirit of God, they show from various passages in the Sacred Writings. Thus St. Paul says, "According to his mercy he hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost†." The same apostle says, again, "It is the law of the Spirit that maketh free from the law of sin and death‡." And again, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God§."

The Quakers say, That this inward redemption or salvation is effected by the Spirit, is obvious also from the experience of all good men, or from the manner, in which many have experienced a total conversion or change of heart. For though there are undoubtedly some, who have gone on so gradually in their reformation from vice to virtue, that it may have been considered to be the effect of reason, which has previously determined on the necessity of a holy life; yet the change from vice to holiness has often been so rapid and decisive, as to leave no doubt whatever that it could not have been produced by any effort of reason, but solely by some Divine operation, which could only have been that of the Spirit of God.

Of these two parts of redemption, the outward and the inward, of which the latter will be the subject of our consideration, it may be observed that they go hand in hand together. St. Paul has coupled them together in these words: "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life‖;" that is, by the life of his Spirit working inwardly in us. And as they go together in the mind of the apostle, so they go together as to the benefit of their effects. For, in the first place, the outward part of redemption takes place when the inward has begun; and, secondly, the outward part of redemption, or the sufferings of Jesus Christ, which redeem from past

* The Quakers believe, however, that this Spirit was more plentifully diffused and that greater gifts were given to men, after Jesus was glorified, than before. Eph. iv. 8.

† Titus iii. 5. ‡ Rom. viii. 2. § Rom. viii. 14.

‖ Romans v. 10.

sins, cannot have any efficacy till the inward has begun, or while men remain in their sins; or, in other words, no man can be entitled to the forgiveness of sins that have been committed, till there has been a change in the inward man; for St. John intimates that the blood of Christ does not cleanse from sin except men walk in the light*, or, to use an expression synonymous with the Quakers, except men walk in the Spirit.

SECTION III.

Inward work of redemption, which thus goes on by the operation of the Holy Spirit, has the power of producing a new birth in men—this office of the Spirit acknowledged by other Christians—Monro, Hammond, Locke—it has the power also of leading to perfection—Sentiments of the Quakers as to perfection—and of the ever memorable John Hales—Gell—Monro—This power of inward redemption bestowed upon all.

The sufferings, then, of Jesus Christ having, by means of the forgiveness of past sins, put men into a capacity of salvation, the remaining part of salvation, or the inward redemption of man, is performed by the operation of the Holy Spirit; of which however it must be remembered, that a more plentiful diffusion is considered by the Quakers to have been given to men after the ascension of Jesus Christ than at any former period.

The nature of this inward work of redemption, or the nature of this new office, which it performs in addition to that of a religious teacher, may be seen in the following account.

It has the power, the Quakers believe, of checking and preventing bad inclinations and passions,—of cleansing and purifying the heart, —of destroying the carnal mind,—of making all old things pass away,—of introducing new,—of raising our spiritual senses, so as to make us delight in the things of God, and to put us above an unreasonable pursuit after earthly pleasures. Redeeming thus from the pollutions of the world, and leading to spiritual purity, it forms a new creature. It produces a new man in the heart. It occasions a man by its quickening power to be born again, and thus puts him in the way to salvation. "For verily I say unto thee," says Jesus Christ to Nicodemus, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God†."

This office and power of the Spirit of God is acknowledged by other Christians. Monro, who has been before quoted, observes, "that the soul, being thus raised from the death of sin and born again, is divinely animated, and discovers that it is alive by the vital operations which it performs."

---

* John i. 6, 7. † John iii. 3.

"Again," says he, "this blissful presence the regenerate, who are delivered from the dominion and cleansed from the impurities of sin, have recovered, and it is on the account of it that they are said to be the habitation of God through the Spirit, and the temple of the Holy Ghost. For that good Spirit takes posession of them, resides in their hearts, becomes the mover, enlightener and director of all their faculties and powers, gives a new and heavenly tincture and tendency to all their inclinations and desires, and, in one word, is the great spring of all they think, or do, or say; and hence it is that they are said to walk no more after the flesh, but after the Spirit, and to be led by the Spirit of God."

Dr. Hammond, in his Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament, observes, that he, "who hath been born of God, is literally he, who hath had such a blessed change wrought in him by the operation of God's Spirit in his heart, as to be translated from the power of darkness into the kingdom of his dear Son."

"As Christ in the flesh," says the great and venerable Locke, "was wholly exempt from all taint and sin; so we by that Spirit, which was in him, shall be exempt from the dominion of carnal lusts, if we make it our choice, and endeavor to live after the Spirit."——

"Here the apostle," says Locke, "shows that Christians are delivered from the dominion of their carnal lusts by the Spirit of God, that is given to them, and dwells in them, as a new quickening principle and power, by which they are put into the state of a spiritual life, wherein their members are made capable of becoming the instruments of righteousness."

And this Spirit of God, which thus redeems from the pollutions of the world, and puts a new heart as it were into man, is considered by the Quakers as so powerful in its operations, as to be able to lead him to perfection. By this they do not mean to say the perfection of man is at all like the perfection of God, because the perfection of the former is capable of growth. They believe, however, that in his renewed state he may be brought to be so perfect, as to be able to keep those commandments of God, which are enjoined him. In this sense they believe it is that Noah is called by Moses a just and perfect man in his generation*, and that Job is described as a perfect and an upright man†, and that the evangelist Luke speaks of Zacharias and Elizabeth in these words: "They were both righteous before God, and walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless‡."

---

* Gen. vi. 9. † Job i. 8. ‡ Luke i. 6.

That man, who is renewed in heart, can attain this degree of perfection, they hold it but reasonable to suppose: for to think that God has given to man any law to keep which it is impossible for him, when aided by his Holy Spirit, to keep; or to think that the power of Satan can be stronger in man than the power of Christ, is to think very inadequately of the Almighty, and to cast a dishonorable reflection on his goodness, his justice, and his power. Add to which that there would not have been such expressions in the New Testament as those of Jesus Christ: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." Nor would there have been other expressions of the apostles of a similar meaning, if the renewed man had not possessed the power of doing the will of God.

This doctrine of Perfection brought the Quakers into disputes with persons of other religious denominations at the time of their establishment. But however it might be disapproved of, it was not new in these times, nor was it originally introduced by them. Some of the fathers of the church, and many estimable divines of different countries, had adopted it. And here it may be noticed, that the doctrine had been received also by several of the religious in our own.

In the Golden Remains of the ever memorable John Hales, we find that "through the grace of Him, that doth enable us, we are stronger than Satan; and the policy of Christian warfare hath as many means to keep back and defend, as the deepest reach of Satan hath to give the onset."

"St. Augustine," says this amiable writer, "was of opinion that it was possible for us even in this natural life, seconded by the grace of God, perfectly to accomplish what the Law requires at our hands." In the Golden Remains many sentiments are to be found of the same tenor.

Bacon, who collected and published Dr. Robert Gell's Remains, says in his Preface, that Dr. Gell preached before King Charles I., on Ephesians iv. 10., at Newmarket, in the year 1631, a bold discourse, yet becoming him, testifying before the king that doctrine he taught to his life's end, "the possibility, through grace, of keeping the law of God in this life." Whoever reads these venerable Remains will find this doctrine inculcated in them.

Monro, who lived some time after Dr. Gell, continued the same doctrine. "So great," says he in his Just Measures, "is the goodness and benignity of God, and so perfect is the justice of his nature, that he will not, cannot, command impossibilties. Whatever he requires of mankind by way of duty, he enables them to perform. This grace goes before and assists their endeavors; so that, when they do not comply with his injunctions, it is because they will not employ

the power that he has given them, and which he is ready to increase and heighten, upon their dutiful improvement of what they have already received, and their serious application to him for more."

Again; "Though of ourselves, and without Christ, we can do nothing, yet with him we can do all things;" and then he adds, a little lower, "Why should any duty frighten us, or seem impossible to us?"

Having now stated it to be the belief of the members of this community that the Spirit of God performs the inward work of redemption in man, and that its powers are such that it may lead him to perfection in the way explained, it remains for me to observe that it is their belief also, that this Spirit has been given for these purposes, without any exception, to all of the human race; or, in the same manner as it was given as an universal teacher, so it has been given as an universal redeemer, to man: and that it acts in this capacity, and fulfills its office, to all those, who attend to its inward strivings, and encourage its influence on their hearts.

That it was given to all for this purpose, they believe to be manifest from the apostle Paul: "For the grace of God," says he, "which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men*." He says, again, that "the Gospel was preached unto every creature which is under heaven†." He defines the Gospel to be "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth‡." He means, therefore, that this inward power of redemption was afforded to all. For the outward Gospel had not been preached to all in the time of the apostle, nor has it been preached to all even at the present day. But these passages are of universal import. They imply no exception. They comprehend every individual of the human race.

That this Spirit was also given to all for these purposes, the Quakers believe, when they consider other passages in the Scriptures, which appear to them to belong to this subject. For they consider this Spirit§ to have begun its inward work of redemption with the fall of the first man, and to have continued it through the patriarchal and Jewish ages to the outward coming of Christ, when there was to be no other inward redemption but by the same means. Thus, by the promise, which was given to Adam, there was to be perpetual enmity between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, though the latter was to vanquish; or, as the Quakers interpret it, between the spirit of sin and the Spirit of God that was placed in man. This

* Titus ii. 11. † Coloss i. 23. ‡ Rom. i. 16.

§ In the same manner Jesus Christ having tasted death for every man, the sacrifice or outward redemption looks backwards and forwards, as well to Adam as to those who lived after the Gospel-times.

promise was fully accomplished by Jesus, (who came from the woman). But the Quakers consider it to have been partially accomplished by many from the time of Adam; for they believe that many, who have attended to the seed of God, or, which is the same thing*, to the portion of the Spirit of God within them, have witnessed the enmity alluded to, and the power of sin, in a great degree, bruised within their own hearts, or have experienced in these early times the redeeming power of the Spirit of God. And except this be the case, they conceive some of the passages, which they suppose to relate to this subject, not to be so satisfactorily explicable as they might be rendered. For it is said of Abraham, that he saw Christ's day. But as Abraham died long before the visible appearance of Christ in the flesh, he could neither have seen Christ outwardly, nor his day. It is still affirmed that he saw Christ's day. And the Quakers say they believe that he saw him inwardly; for he witnessed in his own Spirit, which is the same thing, the redeeming power of the Spirit of God. For as the world was made by the Spirit, or by the Word, which is frequently interpreted to be Christ, so these terms are synonymous, and often used the one for the other. The Quakers, therefore, believe Abraham to have experienced, in a very high degree, the power of this inward redemption†. They believe, also, that Job experienced it in an extraordinary manner. For he asserted that he knew "that his Redeemer lived." But Job could never have said this, except he had alluded to the powerful influence within him, which had purified his heart from the pollution of sin. For, being as early as the time of Moses, he could never have seen any of the Sacred Writings which mentioned Jesus Christ as a Redeemer, or the person of Jesus Christ. The Quakers also consider David, from the numerous expressions to be found in the Psalms, as having experienced this inward work of redemption also. And in the same manner as they conceive this Spirit to have striven with Abraham, and Job, and David, so they conceive it to have striven with others of the same nation for their inward redemption from the power of sin to the time of Jesus Christ. They believe, again, that it has striven with all the Heathen nations from the foundation of the world to the same period. And they believe also that it has continued its office of a Redeemer to all people, whether Jews, Heathens, or Christians, from the time of Jesus Christ to the present day.

---

* 1 John iii. 9. Whoever is born of God does not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

† The Quakers do not deny that Abraham might have seen Christ prophetically, but they believe he saw him particularly in the way described.

SECTION IV.

Proposition of the new birth and perfection, as hitherto explained, explained in the ordinary way—new view of the subject from a more particular detail of the views and expressions of the Quakers concerning it—a new spiritual birth as real from the spiritual seed of the Kingdom, as that of plants or vegetables from their seeds in the natural world—and the new birth proceeds really in the same progressive manner to maturity or perfection—Result of this new view the same as that in the former section.

I stated in the last section that the Spirit of God is considered by the Society as effecting the work of redemption in men; and that in this office it has the power of producing a new birth in them, and of leading them to perfection in the way described. This proposition, however, I explained only in the ordinary way. But as the Quakers have a particular way of viewing and expressing it, and as they deem it one of the most important of their religious propositions, I trust that I shall be excused by the reader if I allot one other section to this subject.

Jesus Christ states, as was said before, in the most clear and positive terms, that except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of Heaven.

Now the great work of religion is salvation or redemption. Without this no man can see God. And therefore the meaning of the words of Jesus Christ will be this,—that except a man be born again, he cannot experience that inward work of redemption, which shall enable him to see the kingdom of Heaven.

Redemption, then, is necessary to qualify for a participation of the heavenly joys; and it is stated to take place by means of the new birth.

The particular ideas, then, which the Quakers have relative to the new birth and perfection, are the following.

In the same manner as the Divine Being has scattered the seeds of plants and vegetables in the body of the earth, so he has implanted a portion of his own incorruptible seed, or of that, which in Scripture-language is called the "Seed of the Kingdom," in the soul of every individual of the human race. As the sun by its genial influence quickens the vegetable seed, so it is the office of the Holy Spirit, in whom is life, and who resides in the temple of man, to quicken that which is heavenly. And in the same manner as the vegetable seed conceives, and brings forth a plant, or a tree with root, stem, and branches; so if the soul, in which the seed of the Kingdom is placed, be willing to receive the influence of the Holy Spirit upon it, this seed is quickened, and a spiritual offspring is produced. Now this

offspring is said to be as real a birth from the seed in the soul by means of the Spirit, as the plant from its own seed by means of the influence of the sun. "The seed of the Kingdom," says Isaac Pennington, "consists not in words or notions of mind, but is an inward thing, an inward spiritual substance in the heart, as real inwardly in its kind as other seeds are outwardly in their kind; and being received by faith, and taking root in man, (his heart, his earth, being ploughed up and prepared for it) it groweth up inwardly, as truly and really as any outward seed doth outwardly."

With respect to the offspring thus produced in the soul of man, it may be variously named. As it comes from the incorruptible seed of God, it may be called a Birth of the Divine Nature or Life. As it comes by the agency of the Spirit, it may be called the Life of the Spirit. As it is new, it may be called the New Man or Creature. Or it may have the appellation of a Child of God. Or it is that spiritual life and light, or that spiritual principle and power within us, which may be called the Annointed or Christ within.

"As this seed," says Barclay, "is received in the heart, and suffered to bring forth its natural and proper effect, Christ comes to be formed and raised, called in Scripture the New Man, Christ within us, the Hope of Glory. Yet herein they (the Quakers) do not equal themselves with the Holy Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, neither destroy his present existence. For though they affirm Christ dwells in them, yet not immediately, but mediately, as he is in that seed which is in them."

Of the same opinion was the learned Cudworth. "We all," says he, "receive of his fulness grace for grace,, as all the stars in heaven are said to light their candles at the sun's flame. For though his body be withdrawn from us, yet by the lively and virtual contact of his Spirit, he is always kindling, cheering, quickening, warming, and enlivening hearts. Nay, this divine life begun and kindled in any heart, wheresoever it be, is something of God in flesh, and, in a sober and qualified sense, Divinity incarnate: and all particular Christians, that are really possessed of it, are so many mystical Christs."

Again: "Never was any tender infant so dear to those bowels that begat it, as an infant new-born Christ, formed in the heart of any true believer, to God the father of it."

This account relative to the new birth the Quakers conceive to be strictly deducible from the Holy Scriptures. It is true, they conceive, as far as the new birth relates to God, and to the seed, and to the Spirit, from the following passages: "Whosoever is born of God

doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him*:"—"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God†:"—"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth‡." It is considered to be true, again, as far as the new birth relates to the creature born, and to the name which it may bear, from these different expressions: "Of whom I travail in birth again, till Christ be formed in you§:"—Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me‖:"—"But ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father¶:"—"But as many as received him, (that is, the Word or Spirit) to them gave he power to become the sons of God**:"—"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God††." And as parents and children resemble one another, so believers are made "conformable to the image of his Son‡‡, who is the image of the invisible God§§."

Having explained in what the new birth consists, or having shown, according to Barclay, "that the seed is a real spiritual substance, which the soul of man is capable of feeling and apprehending, from which that real spiritual inward birth arises, called the new creature or the new man in the heart‖‖;" it remains to show how believers; or those, in whose souls Christ is thus produced, may be said "to grow up to perfection;" for by this real birth or geniture in them, they come to have those spiritual senses raised, by which they are made capable of tasting, smelling, seeing, and handling the things of God.

It may be observed, then, that in the new birth a progress is experienced from infancy to youth, and from youth to manhood. As it is only by submission to the operation of the Spirit that this birth can take place, so it is only by a like submission that any progress or growth from one stature to another will be experienced in it. Neither can the regenerated become instrumental in the redemption of others, any further or otherwise than as Christ or the Annointing dwells and operates in them, teaching them all truths necessary to be known, and strengthening them to perform every act necessary to be done for this purpose. He must be their only means and "hope of glory***." It will be then that "the creature, which waiteth in earnest expectation for the manifestation of the Sons of God, will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God†††." For, "if any man be in

---

* 1 John iii. 9.
† 1 Peter i. 23.
‡ James i. 18.
§ Gal. iv. 19.
‖ Gal. ii. 20.
¶ Rom. viii. 15.
** John i. 12.
†† Rom. viii. 14.
‡‡ Rom. viii. 39.
§§ Coloss. i. 15.
‖‖ Page 138, ed. 8.
*** Coloss. i. 27.
††† Rom. viii. 19, 21.

Christ he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new, and all things of God*."

Those, who are the babes of the regeneration, begin to see spiritual things. The natural man, the mere creature, never saw God. But the babes, who cry Abba Father, begin to see and to know him. Though as yet unskillful in the word of righteousness, "they desire the sincere milk of the word, that they may grow thereby†." And "their sins are forgiven them‡."

Those, who may be considered as the young men in this state, are said to be "spiritually strong, and the word of God abiding in them, to have overcome the wicked one§."

They, who have attained a state of manhood, are called fathers, or are said to be of full age, and to be capable of taking strong meat. "They come, in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto perfect men, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. They arrived at such a state of stability, that they are no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but, speaking the truth in love, grow up unto him in all things, which is the head, even Christ‖."—"The old man with his deeds being put off, they have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him¶."—"They are washed, they are sanctified, they are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and in the Spirit of our God**." The new creation is thus completed, and the Sabbath, wherein man ceases from his own works, is fully attained; so that every believer can then say with the apostle, "I am crucified with Christ. Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life, which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me††."

But this state of manhood, "by which the man of God may be made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works‡‡," does not take place till Christ be fully formed in the souls of believers, or till they are are brought wholly under his rule and government. He must be substantially formed in them. He must actually be their life and their hope of glory. He must be their head and governor. As the head and the body and the members are one, according to the apostle, but the head directs, so Christ, and believers in whom Christ is born and formed, are one spiritual body, which he himself must direct also. Thus Christ, where he is fully formed in man, or where

---

* 2 Cor. v. 17, 18.
† 1 Peter ii. 2.
‡ 1 John ii. 12.
§ 1 John ii. 14.
‖ Ephes. iv. 13, 14, 15.
¶ Coloss. iii. 9, 10.
** 1 Cor. vi. 11.
†† Galat. ii. 20.
‡‡ 2 Tim. iii. 17.

believers are grown up to the measure of the stature and fulness of sonship, is the head of every man, and God is the head of Christ. Thus Christ the begotten entirely governs the whole man, as the head directs and governs all the members of the body; and God the Father, as the head of Christ, entirely guides and governs the begotten. Hence, believers "are Christ's, and Christ is Gods*:" so that ultimately God is all in all.

Having given this new view of the subject, I shall only observe further upon it, that the substance of this chapter turns out to be the same as that of the preceding; or, that the inward work of redemption cannot be effected but through the medium of the Spirit of God. For Christ, according to the ideas now held out, must be born in men, and he must be formed in them, and he must rule them, before they can experience full inward redemption; or, in other words, they cannot experience this inward work of redemption, except they can truly say that he governs them, or except they can truly call him Governor or Lord. But no person can say that Christ rules in him, except he undergoes the spiritual process of regeneration, which has been described; or, to use the words of the apostle, "†no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Spirit‡."

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION I.

Quakers believe from the foregoing account that redemption is possible to all—hence they deny the doctrine of Election and Reprobation—do not deny the texts on which it is founded, but the interpretation of them—as contrary to the doctrines of Jesus Christ and the apostles—as making his mission unnecessary—as rendering many precepts useless—and as casting a stain on the character and attributes of God.

It will appear from the foregoing observations, that it is the belief of the members of this Society that every man, who attends to the strivings of the Holy Spirit, has the power of inward redemption

---

* 1 Cor. iii. 23. † 1 Cor. xii. 3.

‡ The reader will easily discern from this new view of the new birth, how men, according to the Quakers, become partakers of the divine nature, and how the Quakers make it out that Abraham and others saw Christ's day, as I mentioned in a former chapter.

within himself; and that as outward redemption by the sufferings of Jesus Christs extends to all, where the inward has taken place, so redemption or salvation, in its full extent, is possible to every individual of the human race.

This position, however, is denied by those Christians, who have pronounced in favor of the doctrine of Election and Reprobation; because, if they believe some were predestinated from all eternity to eternal happiness, and the rest to eternal misery, they must then believe that salvation is not possible to all, and that it was not intended to be universal.

The Quakers have attempted to answer the objections, which have been thus made to their theory of redemption. And as the reader will probably expect that I should notice what they have said upon this subject, I have reserved the answers they have given for the present place.

In the first place they do not deny the genuineness of any of those texts, which are usually advanced against them. Of all people they fly the least to the cover of interpolation or mutilation of Scripture, to shield themselves from the strokes of their opponents. They believe, however, that there are passages in the Sacred Writings, which will admit of an interpretation different from that which has been assigned them by many; and upon this they principally rely in the present case. If there are passages to which two meanings may be annexed, and if for one there is equal authority as for the other, yet if one meaning should destroy all the most glorious attributes of the Supreme Being, and the other should preserve them as recognized in the other parts of the Scripture, they think they are bound to receive that, which favors the justice, mercy, and wisdom of God, rather than that, which makes him appear both unjust and cruel.

They believe, again, that some Christians have misunderstood the texts, which they quote in favor of the doctrine of Election and Reprobation, for the following reasons:

First, because, if God had from all eternity predestinated some to eternal happiness, and the rest to eternal misery, the mission of Jesus Christ upon earth became unnecessary, and his mediation ineffectual.

If this, again, had been a fundamental doctrine of Christianity, it never could have been overlooked (considering that it is of more importance to men than any other) by the Founder of that religion. But he never delivered any words in the course of his ministry, from whence any reasonable conclusion could be drawn, that such a doctrine formed any part of the creed, which he intended to establish among men. His doctrine was that of Mercy, Tenderness, and Love,

in which he inculcated the power and efficacy of repentance, and declared there was more joy in heaven over one sinner that repented, than over ninety-nine just persons who needed no repentance. By the parable of the Sower, which the Quakers consider to relate wholly to the word or Spirit of God, it appears that persons of all descriptions were visited equally for their salvation; and that their salvation depended much upon themselves, and that, where obstacles arose, they arose from themselves also, by allowing temptations, persecutions, and the cares of the world, to overcome them. In short, they believe that the doctrine of Election and Reprobation is contrary to the whole tenor of the doctrines promulgated by Jesus Christ.

They conceive, also, that this doctrine is contrary to the doctrines promulgated by the Evangelists and Apostles, and particularly contrary to those of St. Paul himself, from whom it is principally taken. To make this apostle contradict himself they dare not. And they must therefore conclude, either that no person has rightly understood it, and that it has hitherto been kept in mystery; or, if it be intelligible to the human understanding, it must be explained by comparing it with other texts of the same apostle, as well as with those of others, and always in connection with the general doctrines of Christianity, and the character and attributes of God. Now the apostle Paul, who is considered to intimate that God predestinated some to eternal salvation, and the rest to eternal misery*, says that "God made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth†;" that in the Gospel-dispensation "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free‡." He desires also Timothy "to make prayers and supplications and intercessions for all men§;" which the Quakers conceive he could not have done, if he had not believed it to be possible that all might be saved. "For this is acceptable," says he, "in the sight of our Savior, who will have all men to be saved; for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all." Again: he says, "that Jesus Christ tasted death for every man||." And in another place he says, "The Grace of God, which bringeth salvation, has appeared unto all men**." But if this grace has appeared to all, none can have been without it; and if its object be salvation, then all must have had sufficient of it to save them, if obedient to its saving operations.

---

* Rom. chap. ix.
† Acts xvii. 26.
‖ Heb. ii. 9.
‡ Coloss. iii. 11.
§ 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
** Titus ii. 11

If the doctrine also of Election and Reprobation be true, then the recommendations of Jesus Christ and of his Apostles, and particularly of Paul himself, can be of no avail, and ought never to have been given. Prayer is inculcated by these as an acceptable duty. But why should men pray, if they are condemned beforehand, and if their destiny is inevitable? If the doctrine, again, be true, then all the exhortations to repentance, which are to be found in the Scriptures, must be unnecessary. For why should men repent, except for a little temporary happiness in this world, if they cannot be saved in a future? This doctrine is considered by the Quakers as making the precepts of the Apostles unnecessary; as setting aside the hopes and encouragements of the Gospel; and as standing in the way of repentance or holiness of life.

This doctrine, again, they consider objectionable, inasmuch as it obliges men to sin, and charges them with the commission of it. It makes also the fountain of all purity the fountain of all sin; and the Author of all good the fountain of all evil. It gives to the Supreme being a malevolence that is not to be found in the character of the most malevolent of creatures. It makes him more cruel than the most cruel oppressor ever recorded of the human race. It makes him to have deliberately made millions of men, for no other purpose than to stand by and delight in their misery and destruction. But is it possible, the Quakers say, for this to be true of him, who is thus described by St. John,—"God is love?"

SECTION II.

Quakers' interpretration of the texts, which relate to this doctrine—these texts of public and private import—Election, as of public import, relates to offices of usefulness, and not to salvation—as of private, it relates immediately to the Jews—these had been elected, but were passed over for the Gentiles—nothing more unreasonable in this than in the case of Ishmael and Esau—or that Pharaoh's crimes should receive Pharaoh's punishment—but though the Gentiles were chosen, they could stand in favor no longer than while they were obedient and faithful.

The members of this community conceive, that in their intrepretation of the passages, which are usually quoted in support of the doctrine of Election and Reprobation, and which I shall now give to the reader, they do no violence to the attributes of the Almighty, but, on the other hand, confirm his wisdom, justice, and mercy, as displayed in the Sacred Writings, in his religious government of the world.

These passages may be considered both as of public and of private import: of public, as they relate to the world at large; of private,

as they relate to the Jews, to whom they were addressed by the apostle.

The Quakers, in viewing the doctrine as of public import, use the words "called," "predestined," and "chosen," in the ordinary way, in which they are used in the Scriptures, or in the way in which Christians generally understand them.

They believe that the Almighty intended from the beginning, to make both individuals and nations subservient to the end, which he had proposed to himself in the creation of the world. For this purpose he gave men different measures of his Holy Spirit; and in proportion as they have used these gifts more extensively than others, they have been more useful among mankind. Now all these may be truly said to have been instrnments in the hands of Providence for the good works, which they have severally performed; but, if instruments in his hands, then they may not improperly be styled Chosen Vessels. In this sense they view the words "chosen" or "called." In the same sense they view also the word "pre-ordained,"—but with this difference, that the instruments were foreknown. And that God should have known these instruments beforehand is not wonderful; for he, who created the world, and who, to use a human expression, must see at one glance all that ever has been, and that is, and that is to come, must have known the means to be employed, and the characters who were to move, in the execution of his different dispensations to the world.

In this sense they conceive that God may be said to have foreknown, called, chosen, and pre-ordained Noah, and also Abraham, and also Moses, and Aaron and his sons, and all the Prophets, and all the Evangelists and Apostles, and all the good men, who have been useful in spiritual services in their own generation or day.

In this sense also many may be said to have been chosen or called in the days of the apostle Paul: for they are described as having had various gifts bestowed upon them by the Spirit of God. "To one was given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another the discerning of spirits, to another prophesy, and to others other kinds of gifts. But the self-same Spirit worked all these, dividing to every man severally as he choose*," that is, particular persons were called by the Spirit of God, in the days of the apostle, to particular offices for the perfecting of his church.

In the same sense the Quakers consider all true ministers of the Gospel to be chosen. They believe that no imposition of hands or human ordination can qualify for this office. God, by means of his

---

* 1 Cor. xii. 10, 11.

Holy Spirit alone, prepares such as are to be the vessels in his house. Those, therefore, who, in obedience to this Spirit, come forth from the multitude to perform spiritual offices, may be said to be called or chosen.

In this sense nations may be said to be chosen also: such were the Israelites, who, by means of their peculiar laws and institutions, were kept apart from the other inhabitants of the world.

Now the question is, if any persons should be said to have been chosen in the Scripture-language, for what were they so chosen? The favorers of the doctrine of Election and Reprobation say, for their salvation. But the Quakers say, this is no where manifest; for the term Salvation is not annexed to any of the passages, from which the doctrine is drawn. Nor do they believe it can be made to appear from any of the Scriptural Writings, that one man is called or chosen, or predestined to Salvation, more than another. They believe on the other hand, that these words relate wholly to the usefulness of individuals; and that if God has chosen any particular persons, he has chosen them that they might be the ministers of good to others, that they might be spiritual lights in the universe; or that they might become, in different times and circumstances, instruments of increasing the happiness of their fellow-creatures. Thus the Almighty may be said to have chosen Noah, to perpetuate the memory of the deluge, to promulgate the origin and history of mankind, and to become, as St. Peter calls him, "a preacher of righteousness" to those, who were to be the ancestors of men. Thus he may be said to have chosen Moses to give the Law, and to lead out the Israelites, and to preserve them as a distinct people, who should carry with them notions of his existence, his providence and his power. Thus he may be said to have chosen the prophets, that men in after ages, seeing their prophesies accomplished, might believe that Christianity was of divine origin. Thus also he may be said to have chosen Paul, (and indeed Paul is described as a chosen vessel*) to diffuse the Gospel among the Gentile world.

That the words "called" or "chosen" relate to the usefulness of individuals in the world, and not to their salvation, the Quakers believe from examining the comparison or simile, which St. Paul has introduced, of the potter and of his clay, upon this very occasion; "Shall the thing formed say unto him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one unto honor and another to dishonor†?" This simile, they say, relates obviously to the uses of these vessels.

---

* Acts ix. 15. † Rom. ix. 20, 21.

The potter makes some for splendid or extraordinary uses and purposes, and others for those which are mean and ordinary. So God has chosen individuals to great and glorious uses, while others remain in the mean or common mass, undistinguished by any very active part in the promotion of the ends of the world. Nor have the latter any more reason to complain that God has given to others greater spiritual gifts, than that he has given to one man a better intellectual capacity than to another.

They argue, again, that the words "called" or "chosen" relate to usefulness, and not to salvation; because, if men were predestined from all eternity to salvation, they could never do anything to deprive themselves of that salvation; that is, they could never do any wrong in this life, or fall from a state of purity: whereas it appears, that many of those, whom the Scriptures consider to have been chosen, have failed in their duty to God; that these have had no better ground to stand upon than their neighbors; that election has not secured them from the displeasure of the Almighty; but that they have been made to stand or fall, notwithstanding their election, as they acted well or ill,—God having conducted himself no otherwise to them than he has done to others in his moral government of the world.

That persons so chosen have failed in their duty to God, or that election has not preserved them from sin, is apparent, it is presumed, from the Scriptures. For, in the first place, the Israelites were a chosen people. They were the people to whom the apostle addressed himself, in the chapter which has given rise to the doctrine of Election and Reprobation, as the elected, or as having had the preference over the descendants of Esau and others. And yet this election did not secure to them a state of perpetual obedience, or the continual favor of God. In the wilderness they were frequently rebellious, and they were often punished. In the time of Malachi, to which the apostle directs their attention, they were grown so wicked, that God is said to have no pleasure in them, and that he would not receive an offering at their hands*. And in subsequent times, or in the time of the apostle, he tells them, that they were then passed over, notwithstanding their election, on account of their want of righteousness and faith and that the Gentiles were chosen in their place†.

In the second place, Jesus Christ is said in the New Testament to have called or chosen his disciples. But this call or election did not secure the good behavior of Judas, or protect him from the displeasure of his Master.

---

* Malachi i. 10. † Rom. ix. 30, 31, 32.

In the third place it may be observed, that the apostle Paul considers the churches under his care, as called or chosen, as consisting of people, who came out of the great body of the heathen world, to become a select community under the Christian name. He endeavors to inculcate in them a belief that they were the Lord's people; that they were under his immediate or particular care; that God knew and loved them, before they knew and loved him: and yet this election, it appears, did not secure them from falling off; for many of them became apostates in the time of the apostle, so that "he was grieved fearing that he had bestowed upon them his labor in vain." Neither did this election secure even to those, who then remained in the church, any certainty of salvation; otherwise the apostle would not have exhorted them so earnestly "to continue in goodness, lest they should be cut off."

The Quakers believe, again, that the apostle Paul never included salvation in the words "called" or "chosen," for another reason.

For if these words had implied salvation, then non-election might have implied the destruction annexed to it by the favorers of the doctrine of Reprobation. But no person, who knows whom the apostle meant, when he mentions those who had received and those who had lost the preference, entertains any such notion or idea. For who believes that, because Isaac is said to have had the preference of Ishmael, and Jacob of Esau, that therefore Ishmael and Esau, who were quite as great princes in their times as Isaac and Jacob, were to be doomed to eternal misery? Who believes that this preference (and the apostle alludes to no other) ever related to the salvation of souls? or rather, that it did not wholly relate to the circumstance, that the descendants of Isaac and Jacob were to preserve the church of God in the midst of the Heathen nations, and that the Messiah was to come from their own line, instead of that of their elder brethren? Rejection or Reprobation, too, in the sense in which it is generally used by the advocates for the doctrine, is contrary, in a second point of view, in the opinion of the Quakers, to the sense of the comparison or simile made by the apostle on this occasion. For when a potter makes two sorts of vessels, or such as are mean and such as are fine and splendid, he makes them for their respective uses. But he never makes the meaner sort for the purpose of dashing them to pieces.

The doctrine therefore in dispute, if viewed as a doctrine of general import, only means, in the opinion of the Society, that the Almighty has a right to dispose of his spiritual favors as he pleases, and that he has given accordingly different measures of his Spirit to different people; but that, in doing this, he does not exclude others

from an opportunity of salvation, or a right to life. On the other hand, they believe that he is no respecter of persons, only as far as obedience is concerned; that election neither secures of itself good behaviour, nor protects from punishment; that every man, who standeth, must take heed lest he fall; that no man can boast of his election, so as to look down with contempt upon his meaner brethren; and that there is no other foundation for an expectation of the continuance of Divine favor than a religious life.

In viewing the passages in question as of private import, which is the next view the Quakers take of them, the same lesson, and no other, is inculcated. The apostle, in the ninth chapter of the Romans, addresses himself to the Jews, who had been a chosen people, and rescues the character of God from the imputation of injustice, in having passed over them, and in having admitted the Gentiles to a participation of his favors.

The Jews had depended so much upon their privileges, as the children of Abraham, and so much upon their ceremonial observances of the law, that they conceived themselves to have a right to continue to be the peculiar people of God. The apostle, however, teaches them, in the ninth and the eleventh chapters of the Romans, a different lesson, and may be said to address them in the following manner:

"I am truly sorry, my kinsmen in the flesh, that you, who have always considered yourselves the elder and chosen branches of the family of the world, should have been passed over; and that the Gentiles, whom you have always looked upon as the younger should be now preferred. But God is just. He will not sanction unrighteousness in any; nor will he allow any choice of his to continue persons in favor longer than, after much long suffering, he finds them deserving his support. You are acquainted with your own history. The Almighty, as you know, undoubtedly distinguished the posterity of Abraham, but he was not partial to them alike. Did he not reject Ishmael the scoffer, though he was the eldest son of Abraham, and countenance Isaac, who was the younger? Did he not pass over Esau, the eldest son of Isaac, who had sold his birthright, and prefer Jacob? Did he not set aside Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, the three eldest sons of Jacob, who were guilty of incest, treachery, and murder, and choose that the Messiah should come from Judah, who was but the fourth? But if in these instances he did not respect eldership, why do you expect that he will not pass you over for the Gentiles, if ye continue in unbelief?

"But so true it is that he will not support any, whom he may have chosen, longer than they continue to deserve it, that he will not even

continue his countenance to the Gentiles, though he has now preferred them, if by any misconduct they should become insensible of his favors. For I may compare both you and them to an olive-tree*. If some of you, for instance, who are the elder or natural branches, should be broken off, and the Gentiles, being a wild olive-tree, should be grafted in among you, and with you partake of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, it would not become them to boast against you the branches: for, if they boast, they do not bear the root, but the root them. Perhaps, however, they might say, that you the branches were broken off, that they might be grafted in. Well; but it was wholly on account of unbelief that you were broken off, and it was wholly by faith that they themselves were taken in. But it becomes them not to be high-minded, but to fear. For if God spared not you, the natural branches, let them take heed, lest he also spare not them."

"Moreover, my kinsmen in the flesh, I must tell you, that you have not only no right to complain because the Gentiles have been preferred, but that you would have no right to complain, even if you were to become the objects of God's vengeance. You cannot forget, in the history of your own nation, the example of Pharaoh. You are acquainted with his obstinacy and disobedience. You know that he stifled his convictions from day to day. You know that by stifling these, or by resisting God's Holy Spirit, he became daily more hardened; and that, by allowing himself to become daily more hardened, he fitted himself for a vessel of wrath, or prepared the way for his own destruction. You know, at length, that God's judgments, but not till after much long-suffering, came upon him, so that the power of God became thus manifested to many. But if you know all these things, and continue in unrighteousness and unbelief, which were the crimes of Pharaoh also, why do you imagine that your hearts will not become hardened like the heart of Pharaoh; and that if, in consequence, you are guilty of Pharaoh's crimes, you are not deserving of Pharaoh's punishment?"

---

* Rom. xi. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.

CHAPTER IX.

Recapitulation of all the doctrines hitherto laid down with respect to the influence of the Spirit—objection to this, that the Quakers make everything of the Spirit, and but little of Jesus Christ—objections only noticed to show that Christians have not always a right apprehension of scriptural terms, and therefore often quarrel with one another about trifles—or that there is, in this particular case, no difference between the doctrine of the Quakers and that of the objectors on this subject.

I SHALL now recapitulate in few words, or in one general proposition, all the doctrines, which have been advanced relative to the power of the Spirit; and shall just notice an argument, which will probably arise on such a recapitulation, before I proceed to a new subject.

The Quakers, then, believe that the Spirit of God formed or created the world. They believe that a portion of it was given to men, after this creation, as a guide to them in their spiritual concerns. They believe that this portion of it was continued to them after the Deluge, in the same manner and for the same purposes, to the time of Christ. It was given, however, in this interval, to different persons in different degrees. Thus Moses was more illuminated by it than his cotemporaries; for it became through him the Author of the Law. Thus the prophets received a greater portion of it than ordinary persons in their own times. In the time of Christ it continued the same office; but it was then given more diffusively than before, and also more diffusively to some than to others. Thus the Evangelists and Apostles received it in an extraordinary degree; and it became through them, and Jesus Christ their head, the Author of the Gospel. But, besides its office of a spiritual light and guide to men in their spiritual concerns, during all the period now assigned, it became to them, as they attended to its influence, an inward redeemer, producing in them a new birth, and leading them to perfection. And as it was thus both a guide and an inward redeemer, so it has continued these offices to the present day.

From hence it will be apparent, that the acknowledgment of God's Holy Spirit in its various operations, as given in different portions before and after the sacrifice of Christ, is the acknowledgment of a principle, which is the great corner-stone of the religion of the Quakers. Without this there can be no knowledge, in their opinion, of spiritual things. Without this there can be no spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures themselves. Without this there can be no

redemption either by inward or outward means. Without this there can be no enjoyment of the knowledge of divine things. Take, therefore, this principle away from them, and you take away their religion at once. Take away the Spirit, and Christianity remains with them no more Christianity, than the dead carcase of a man, when the Spirit is departed, remains a man. Whatsoever is excellent, whatsoever is noble, whatsoever is worthy, whatsoever is desirable in the Christian faith, they ascribe to this Spirit; and they believe that true Christianity can no more subsist without it, tha the outward world could exist without the vital influence of the sun.

Now an objection will be made to the proposition, as I have just stated it, by some Christians, and even by those, who do not wish to derogate from the Spirit of God, (for I have frequently heard it started by such) that the Quakers, by means of these doctrines, make everything of the Spirit, and but little of Jesus Christ*. I shall therefore notice this objection in this place, not so much with a view of answering it, as of attempting to show, that Christians have not always a right apprehension of scriptural terms, and therefore that they sometimes quarrel with one another about trifles; or rather, that when they have disputes with each other, there is sometimes scarcely a shade of difference between them.

To those who make the objection I shall describe the proposition, which has been stated above, in different terms. I shall leave out the words "Spirit of God," and I shall wholly substitute the term "Christ." This I shall do upon the authority of some of our best Divines. The proposition will then run thus:

God, by Christ, created the world, "for without him was not any thing made that was made."

He made, by Christ, also, the terrestrial globe, on which we live. He made the whole host of heaven. He made therefore, besides our own, other planets and other worlds.

He caused also, by Christ, the generation of all animated nature, and of course of the life and vital powers of man.

He occasioned also, by the same Christ, the generation of reason or intellect, and of a spiritual faculty, to man.

Man, however, had not long been created before he fell into sin. It pleased God, therefore, that the same Christ, which had thus appeared in creation, should strive inwardly with man, and awaken his spiritual faculties, by which he might be able to know good from

* The Quakers make much of the advantages of Christ's coming in the flesh. Among these are considered the sacrifice of his own body, a more plentiful diffusion of the Spirit, and a clearer revelation relative to God and man.

evil, and to obtain inward redemption from the pollutions of sin. And this inward striving of Christ was to be with every man, in after times, so that all would be inexcusable, and subjected to condemnation, if they sinned.

It pleased God also, in process of time, as the attention of man was led astray by bad customs, by pleasures, by the cares of the world and other causes, that the same Christ, in addition to this his inward striving with him, should afford him outward help, accommodated to his outward senses, by which his thoughts might be oftener turned towards God, and his soul be the better preserved in the way of salvation. Christ accordingly, through Moses and the Prophets, became the author of a dispensation to the Jews, that is, of their Laws, Types, and Customs, of their Prophecies, and of their Scriptures.

But as in the education of man things must be gradually unfolded, so it pleased God, in the scheme of his redemption, that the same Christ, in fullness of time, should take flesh, and become personally upon earth the author of another, but of a more pure and glorious dispensation than the former, which was to be more extensive also, and which was not to be confined to the Jews, but to extend in time to the uttermost corners of the earth. Christ therefore became the author of the inspired delivery of the outward Scriptures of the New Testament. By these, as by outward and secondary means, he acted upon men's senses. He informed them of their corrupt nature, of their awful and perilous situation, of another life, of a day of judgment, of rewards and punishments. These Scriptures therefore, of which Christ was the author, were outward instruments at the time, and continue so to posterity, to second his inward aid. That is, they produce thought, give birth to anxiety, excite fear, promote seriousness, turn the eye towards God, and thus prepare the heart for a sense of those inward strivings of Christ, which produce inward redemption from the power and guilt of sin.

Where, however, this outward aid of the Holy Scriptures has not reached, Christ continues to purify and redeem by his inward power. But as men, who are acted upon solely by his inward strivings, have not the same advantages as those who are also acted upon by his outward word, so less is expected in the one than in the other case. Less is expected from the Gentile than from the Jew, less from the Barbarian than from the Christian.

And this latter doctrine of the universality of the striving of Christ with man, in a spiritually instructive and redemptive capacity, as it is merciful and just, so it is worthy of the wise and beneficent Creator. Christ, in short, has been filling, from the foundation of the

world, the office of an inward Redeemer, and this, without any exception, to all of the human race. And there is even "now no salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved*."

From this new statement of the proposition, which statement is consistent with the language of divines, it will appear that, if the Quakers have made everything of the Spirit, and but little of Christ, I have made, to suit the objectors, everything of Christ, and but little of the Spirit. Now, I would ask, Where lies the difference between the two statements? Which is the more accurate? or whether, when I say these things were done by the Spirit, and when I say that they were done by Christ, I do not state precisely the same proposition, or express the same thing.

That Christ, in all the offices stated by the proposition, is neither more nor less than the spirit of God, there can surely be no doubt. In looking at Christ, we are generally apt to view him with carnal eyes. We can seldom divest ourselves of the idea of a body belonging to him, though this was confessedly human, and can seldom consider him as a pure Principle or Fountain of divine Light and Life to men. And yet it is obvious, that we must view him in this light in the present case; for, if he was at the Creation of the World, or with Moses at the delivery of the Law, (which the proposition supposes) he could not have been there in his carnal body, because this was not produced until centuries afterwards from the Virgin Mary. In this abstracted light the Apostles frequently view Christ themselves. Thus St. Paul: "I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me†." And again: "Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates ‡?" Now, no person imagines that St. Paul had any idea, that the body of Christ was either in himself, or in others, on the occasion on which he has thus spoken.

That Christ, as he held the offices contained in the proposition, was the Spirit of God, we may pronounce from various views, which we may take of him, all of which seem to lead us to the same conclusion.

And first, let us look at Christ in the scriptural light, in which he has been held forth to us in the fourth section of the seventh chapter, where I have explained the particular notions of the Quakers relative to the new birth. God may be considered here as having produced, by means of his Holy Spirit, a birth of divine life in the soul of "the body which had been prepared," and this birth was Christ. "But that which is born of the Spirit," says St. John, "is

* Acts iv. 12. † Galat. ii. 20. ‡ 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

Spirit*." The only question then will be as to the magnitude of the Spirit thus produced. In answer to this, St. John says, "that God gave him not the Spirit by measure†." And St. Paul says the same thing: "For in him all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt bodily‡." Now we can have no idea of a Spirit without measure, or containing the fullness of the Godhead, but the Spirit of God.

Let us now look at Christ in another point of view, or as St. Paul seems to have viewed him. He defines Christ "to be the Wisdom of God and the Power of God§." But what are the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, but the great characteristics and the great constituent parts of his Spirit?

But if these views of Christ should not be deemed satisfactory, we will contemplate him, as St. John the evangelist has held him forth to our notice. Moses says that the Spirit of God created the world. But St. John says that the Word created it. The Spirit therefore and the Word must be the same. But this word he tells us afterwards, and this positively, was Jesus Christ.

It appears therefore from these || observations, that it makes no material difference, whether we use the words "Spirit of God," or "Christ," in the proposition that has been before us, or that there will be no difference in the meaning of the proposition either in the one or the other case; and also that if the Quakers only allow, when the Spirit took flesh, that the ¶ body was given as a sacrifice for sin, or that a part of the redemption of man, as far as his past sins are forgiven, is effected by this sacrifice, there will be little or no difference between the religion of the Quakers, and that of the objectors, as far as it relates to Christ**.

---

* John iii. 6. † John iii. 34. ‡ Coloss. ii. 9 § 1 Cor. i. 24.

|| I would not have it understood from this little statement of my own (invented merely to show how nearly Christians may be to each other when they think they differ) that the Quakers always consider Christ and the Spirit the same, or the former only as a principle. "There is a difference," says Isaac Pennington, "between the fullness of the Light, which enlighteneth, and the measure that is given. The one is Christ himself. The other is his gift."

¶ I ought to mention here that the Quakers believe that the atonement involved much greater sufferings than merely the death of the body of Christ. They conceive that the nature of a propitiation for sin, made to an infinitely holy and just God, and the expressions of Christ, "my soul is exceedingly sorrowful even unto death," "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," point to a much greater sacrifice.

** The Quakers have frequently said in their theological writings, that every man has a portion of the Holy Spirit within him; and this assertion has not been censured. But they have also said that every man has a portion of Christ, or of the Light of Christ, within him. Now this assertion has been considered extravagant and wild. The reader will therefore see, that if he admits the one, he cannot very consistently censure the other.

CHAPTER X.

SECTION I.

Ministers—The Spirit of God alone can make a minister of the Gospel—Hence no imposition of hands, nor human knowledge, can be effectual—This proposition not peculiarly adopted by George Fox, but by Justin the Martyr, Luther, Calvin, Wickliff, Tyndal, Milton, and others—Way in which this call by the Spirit qualifies for the ministry—Women equally qualified with men.

HAVING now detailed fully the operations of the Spirit of God, as far as the Quakers believe it to be concerned in the instruction and redemption of man, I shall consider its operations, as far as they believe it to be concerned in the services of the church. Upon this Spirit they make both their worship and their ministry to depend. I shall therefore consider these subjects, before I proceed to any new order of tenets, which they may hold.

It is a doctrine of the members of this community, that none can spiritually exercise, and that none ought to be allowed to exercise. the office of ministers, but such as the spirit of God has worked upon and called forth to discharge it; as well as that the same Spirit will never fail to raise up persons in succession for this end.

Conformably with this idea, no person, in the opinion of the Society, ought to be designed by his parents in early youth for the priesthood; for as the wind bloweth where it listeth, so no one can say which is the vessel that is to be made to honor.

Conformably with the same idea, no imposition of hands, or ordination, can avail anything, in their opinion, in the formation of a minister of the Gospel; for no human power can communicate to the internal man the spiritual gifts of God.

Neither, in conformity with the same idea, can the acquisition of human learning, nor the obtaining of academical degrees and honors, be an essential qualification for this office: for though the human intellect is so great, that it can dive as it were into the ocean, and discover the laws of fluids, and rise again up to heaven, and measure the celestial motions, yet it is incapable of itself of penetrating into divine things, to as spiritually to know them: while, on the other hand, illiterate men appear often to have more knowledge on these subjects than the most learned. Indeed the Quakers have no notion of a human qualification for a divine calling. They reject all school divinity, as necessarily connected with the

ministry. They believe, that if a knowledge of Christianity had been obtainable by the acquisition of the Greek and Roman languages, and through the medium of the Greek and Roman philosophers, the Greeks and Romans themselves had been the best proficients in it; whereas the gospel was only foolishness to many of these. They say with St. Paul to the Colossians, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ*." And they say with the same apostle to Timothy, "O Timothy! keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of Science falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith†."

This notion of the Quakers, that human learning and academical honors are not necessary for the priesthood, is very ancient. Though George Fox introduced it into his new Society, and this without any previous reading upon the subject, yet it had existed long before his time. In short, it was connected with the tenet, early disseminated in the church, that no person could know spiritual things but through the medium of the Spirit of God; from whence it was not difficult to pass to the doctrine, that none could teach spiritually, unless they had been taught spiritually themselves. Hence we find Justin the martyr, a Platonic philosopher, but who was afterwards one of the earliest Christian writers after the Apostles, and other learned men after him down to Chrysostom, laying aside their learning and their philosophy for the school of Christ. The first authors also of the Reformation contended for this doctrine. Luther and Calvin, both of them, supported it. Wickliff, the first reformer of the English Church, and Tyndal the martyr, the first translator of the Bible into the English language, supported it also. In 1652, Sydrach Simpson, master of Pembroke-hall, in Cambridge, preached a sermon before the University, contending that the universities corresponded to the schools of the prophets, and that human learning was an essential qualification for the priesthood. This sermon, however, was answered by William Dell, master of Caius College in the same university; in which he stated, after having argued the points in question, that the universities did not correspond to the schools of the prophets, but to those of heathen men; that Plato, Aristotle, and Pythagoras, were more honored there, than Moses or Christ; that Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Ethics, Physics, Metaphysics, and the Mathematics, were not the instruments to be used in the promotion or defence of the Gospel; that Christian schools had originally

* Coloss. ii. 8. † 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

brought men from Heathenism to Christianity, but that the University-schools were likely to carry men from Christianity to Heathenism again. This language of William Dell was indeed the general language of the divines and pious men of those times, in which George Fox lived, though unquestionably the opposite doctrine had been started, and had been received by many. Thus the great John Milton, who lived in these very times, may be cited, as speaking in a similar manner with Dell on the same subject: "Next," says he, "it is a fond error, though too much believed among us, to think that the University makes a minister of the Gospel. What it may conduce to other arts and sciences, I dispute not now. But that, which makes fit a minister, the Scripture can best inform us to be only from above, whence also we are bid to seek them. Thus St. Matthew says: 'Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send laborers forth unto his harvest*.' Thus St. Luke: 'The flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers†.' Thus St. Paul: 'How shall they preach, unless they be sent‡?' But by whom sent? By the University, or by the magistrate? No, surely. But sent by God, and by him only."

The Quakers then, rejecting school-divinity, continue to think with Justin, Luther, Dell, Milton, and indeed with those of the church of England, and others, that those only can be proper ministers of the church, who have witnessed within themselves a call from the Spirit of God. If men would teach religion, they must, in the opinion of the Society, be first taught of God. They must go first to the school of Christ; must come under his discipline in their hearts; must mortify the deeds of the body; must crucify the flesh, with the affections and lusts thereof; must put off the old man, which is corrupt; must put on the new man, "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;" must be, in fact, "ministers of the sanctuary and true tabernacle, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man." And whether those, who come forward as ministers, are really acted upon by this Spirit, or by their own imaginations only, so that they mistake the one for the other, the Quakers consider it to be essentially necessary, that they should experience, what they suppose to be such a call, in their own feelings; and that purification of heart, which they can only judge of by their outward lives, should be perceived by themselves, before they presume to enter upon such an office.

They believe that men qualified in this manner are really fit for the ministry, and are likely to be useful instruments in it. For, first, it

---

* Matt. ix. 38. † Acts xx. 28. ‡ Rom. x. 15.

becomes men to be changed themselves, before they can change others. Those, again, who have been thus changed, have the advantage of being able to state, from living experience, what God has done for them; "what they have seen with their eyes, what they have looked upon, and what their hands have handled of the Word of Life*." Men also, who by means of God's Holy Spirit have escaped the pollutions of the world, are in a fit state to understand the mysteries of God, and to carry with them the seal of their own commission. Thus, men under sin can never discern spiritual things. But "to the disciples of Christ," and to the doers of his will, "it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven." Thus, when the Jews marvelled at Christ, saying, "How knoweth this man letters (or the Scriptures), having never learned †? Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his who sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Such ministers also are considered as better qualified to reach the inward states of the people, and to "preach liberty to the captives" of sin, than those, who have merely the advantage of school-divinity, or of academical learning. It is believed also of these, that they are capable of giving more solid and lasting instruction, when they deliver themselves at large; for those, who preach rather from intellectual abilities, and from the suggestions of human learning, than from the spiritual life and power which they find within themselves, may be said to forsake Christ, who is the "living fountain, and to hew out broken cisterns, which hold no water," either for themselves or for others.

This qualification for the ministry being allowed to be the true one, it will follow, the Quakers believe (and it was Luther's belief also) that women may be equally qualified to become ministers of the Gospel as the men. For they contend that God has given his Holy Spirit, without exception, to all. They dare not therefore limit its operations in the office of the ministry, more than in any other of the sacred offices, which it may hold. They dare not, again, say, that women cannot mortify the deeds of the flesh, or that they cannot be regenerated, and walk in newness of life. If women therefore believe they have a call to the ministry, and undergo the purification necessarily connected with it, and preach in consequence, and preach effectively,—they dare not, under these circumstances, refuse to accept their preaching, as the fruits of the Spirit, merely because it comes through the medium of the female sex.

Against, this doctrine of the Society, that a female ministry is allow-

---

* John i. 1. † John vii. 15, 16, 17.

able under the Gospel-dispensation, an objection has been started from the following words from the apostle Paul: "Let your women keep silence in the churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak *"—"And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home." But the Quakers conceive, that this charge of the apostle has no allusiou to preaching. In these early times, when the Gospel-doctrines were new, and the people were eager to understand them, some of the women, in the warmth of their feelings, interrupted the service of the church, by asking such questions as occurred to them on the subject of this new religion. These are they, whom the apostle desires to be silent, and to reserve their questions till they should return home. And that this was the case is evident, they conceive, from the meaning of the words which the apostle uses upon this occasion. For the word in the Greek tongue, which is translated "speak," does not mean to preach or to pray, but to speak as in common discourse. And the words, which immediately follow this, do not relate to any evangelical instruction, which these women were desirous of communicating publicly, but which they were desirous of receiving themselves from others.

That the words quoted do not relate to praying or preaching is also equally obvious in the opinion of the Quakers; for if they had related to these offices of the church, the word "prophesy" had been used instead of the word "speak." Add to which, that the apostle in the same Epistle in which the preaching of women is supposed to be forbidden, gives them a rule to which he expects them to conform, when they either prophesy or pray. But to give women a rule to be observed during their preaching, and to forbid them to preach at the same time, is an absurdity too great to be fixed upon the most ordinary person, and much more upon an inspired apostle.

That the objection has no foundation, the Society believe, again, from the consideration, that the ministry of women, in the days of the Apostles, is recognized in the New Testament, and is recognized also, in some instances, as an acceptable service.

Of the hundred-and-twenty persons who were assembled on the Day of Pentecost, it is said by St. Luke, that † some were women. That these received the Holy Spirit as well as the men; and that they received it also for the purpose of prophesying or preaching, is obvious from the same evangelist: for, first, he says that "all were filled with the Holy Ghost." And, secondly, he says that Peter stood up, and observed concerning the circumstance of inspiration having been given to the women on this occasion, that Joel's proph-

* 1 Corr. xiv. 34, 35. † Acts, chap. i.

esy was then fulfilled, in which were to be found these words: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that your sons and your daughters shall prophesy—and on my servants and handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy."

That women preached afterwards, or in times subsequent to the Day of Pentecost, they collect from the same evangelist. For he mentions * Philip, who had four daughters, all of whom prophesied at Cæsarea. Now by prophesying, if we accept St. Paul's interpretation of it†, is meant a speaking to edification, and exhortation, and comfort, under the influence of the Holy Spirit. It was also a speaking to the church. It was also the speaking of one person to the church, while the others remained silent.

That women also preached or prophesied in the church of Corinth, the Quakers show from the testimony of St. Paul; for he states the manner in which they did it, or that they prayed and prophesied with their heads uncovered‡.

That women also were ministers of the Gospel in other places, and that they were highly serviceable to the church, St. Paul confesses, with great satisfaction, in his Epistle to the Romans, in which he sends his salutation to different persons, for whom he professed an affection or an esteem. Thus: "I commend unto you Phœbe, our sister, who is a servant of the church, which is at Cenchreas§." Upon this passage the Quakers usually make two observations. The first is, That the Greek word, which is translated "servant," should have been rendered "minister." It is translated "minister," when applied by St. Paul to Timothy to denote this office‖. It is also translated "minister" when applied to St. Paul and Apollos¶. And there is no reason why a change should have been made in its meaning in the present case. The second is, That history has handed down Phœbe as a woman eminent for her Gospel labors. "She was celebrated," says Theodoret, "throughout the world; for she was known not only to the Greeks and the Romans, but to the Barbarians likewise**."

St. Paul also greets Priscilla and Aquila. He greets them under the title of Fellow-helpers or Fellow-laborers in Jesus Christ. But this is the same title, which he bestows upon Timothy to denote his usefulness in the church. Add to which, that Priscilla and Aquila were the persons, of whom St. Luke says, that they assisted Apollos "in expounding to him the way of God more perfectly††."

---

* Acts xxi. 9. † 1 Cor. xiv. ‡ 1 Corr. xi. 5.

§ Romans xiv. 1. ‖ 1 Thess. iii. 2. ¶ 1 Corr. iii. 5.

** In universa terra celebris facta est; nec eam soli Romani, &c.

†† Acts xviii. 24, 26.

In the same Epistle, he recognizes also other women, as having been useful to him in Gospel labors. Thus: "Salute Tryphena, and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, who labored much in the Lord."

From these, and from other observations which might be made upon this subject, the Society are of opinion that the ministry of the women was as acceptable, in the time of the Apostles, as the ministry of the men. And as there is no prohibition against the preaching of women in the New Testament, they see no reason why they should not be equally admissible, and equally useful as ministers, at the present day.

SECTION II.

Way in which Quakers are admitted into the ministry—When acknowledged they preach to their different congregations or meetings—they visit occasionally the different families in their own counties or quarterly meetings—Manner of these family visits—sometimes travel as ministers through particular counties, or the kingdom at large—sometimes into foreign parts—Women share in these labors—Expense of voyages on such occasions defrayed out of the national stock.

The way in which Quakers, whether men or women, who conceive themselves to be called to the office of the ministry, are admitted into it, so as to be acknowledged by the Society to be ministers of its church, is simply as follows:

Any member has a right to rise up in the meetings for worship, and to speak publicly. If any one, therefore, should rise up and preach, who has never done so before, he is heard. The congregation are all witnesses of his doctrine. The Elders, however, who may be present, and to whose province it more immediately belongs to judge of the fitness of ministers, observe the tenor of his discourse. They watch over it for its authority; that is, they judge by its spiritual influence on the mind, whether it be such as corresponds with that, which may be presumed to come from the Spirit of God. If the new preacher delivers any thing that appears exceptionable, or preaches without spiritual authority, and continues to do so, it is the duty of the Elders to speak to him in private, and to desire him to discontinue his services to the church. But if nothing exceptionable occurs, nothing is said to him, except by the same Elders, who may encourage him, and he is allowed to deliver himself publicly at future meetings. In process of time, if after repeated attempts in the office of the ministry the new preacher has given satisfactory proof of his gift, he is reported to the monthly meeting, to which he belongs. And this meeting, if satisfied with his ministry, acknow-

knowledges him as a minister, and then recommends him to the meeting of ministers and elders belonging to the same. No other act than this is requisite. He receives no verbal or written appointment, or power, for the execution of the sacerdotal office. It may be observed also, that he neither gains any authority, nor loses any privilege, by thus becoming a minister of the Gospel. Except while in the immediate exercise of his calling, he is only a common member. He receives no elevation by the assumption of any nominal title to distinguish him from the rest. Nor is he elevated by the prospect of any increase to his werldly goods in consequence of his new office, for no minister in this Society receives any pecuniary emolument for his spiritual labors.

When ministers are thus approved and acknowledged, they exercise the sacred office in public assemblies, as they immediately feel themselves influenced to that work.

They may engage also, with the approbation of their own monthly meetings, in the work of visiting such families as reside in the county or quarterly meeting, to which they belong. In this case they are sometimes accompanied by one of the elders of the church. These visits have the name of family-visits, and are conducted in the following manner:

When a minister, after having commenced his journey, has entered the house of the first family, the individual members are collected to receive him. They then sit in silence for a time. As he believes himself concerned to speak, he delivers that, which arises in his mind, with religious freedom. The master, the wife, and the other branches of the family are sometimes severally addressed. Does the minister feel that there is a departure in any of the persons present from the principles or practice of the Society, he speaks, if he believes it required of him, to these points. Is there any well-disposed person under inward discouragement, this person may be addressed in the language of consolation. All, in fact, are exhorted and advised as their several circumstances may seem to require. When the religious visit is over, the minister, if there is occasion, takes some little refreshment with the family, and converses with them; but no light or trifling subject is ever entered upon on these occasions. From one family he passes on to another, till he has visited all the families in the district, for which he had felt a concern.

Though Quaker ministers frequently confine their spiritual labors to the county or quarterly meeting, in which they reside, yet some of them feel an engagement to go beyond these boundaries, and to visit the Society in particular counties, or in the kingdom at large. Those, who feel a concern of this kind, must lay it before their own

monthly meetings. These meetings, if they feel it right to countenance the concern, grant them certificates for the purpose. These certificates are necessary; first, because ministers might not be personally known as ministers out of their own district, and, secondly, because Quakers, who were not ministers, and other persons, who might counterfeit the dress of Quakers, might otherwise impose upon the Society as they travelled along.

Such as thus travel in the work of the ministry, or Public Friends as they are called, seldom or never go to an inn at any town or village where members live. They go to the houses of the latter. While at these, they attend the weekly, monthly, and quarterly meetings of the district as they happen on their route. They call also extraordinary meetings of worship. At these houses they are visited by many of the members of the place and neighborhood, who call upon and converse with them. During these times, they appear to have their minds bent on the object of their mission, so that it would be difficult to divert their attention from the work in hand. When they have staid a sufficient time at a town or village, they depart. One or more guides are appointed by the particular meeting, belonging to it, to show them the way to the next place where they purpose to labor, and to convey them free of expense, and to conduct them to the house of some member there. From this house, when their work is finished, they are conveyed and conducted by new guides to another, and so on, till they return to their respective homes.

But the religious views of the ministers are not always confined even within the boundaries of the kingdom. Many of them believe it to be their duty to travel into foreign parts. These, as their journey is now extensive, must lay their concern not only before their own monthly meeting, but before their own quarterly meeting, and before the meeting of ministers and elders in London also. On receiving their certificates they depart. Some of them visit the continent of Europe, but most of them the churches in America, where they diligently labor in the vineyard, probably for a year or two, at a distance from their families and friends. And here it may be observed that, while ministers from England are thus visiting America on a religious errand, ministers from America, impelled by the same influence, are engaging in apostolical missions to England. These foreign visits, on both sides, are not undertaken by such ministers only as are men. Women engage in them also. They cross the Atlantic, and labor in the vineyard in the same manner. It may be mentioned here, that though it is a principle in the society, that no minister of the Gospel ought to be paid for his reli-

gious labors, yet the expense of the voyages, on such occasions, is allowed to be defrayed out of the fund which is denominated by the Quakers their "National Stock."

CHAPTER XI.

Elders—Their appointment—one part of their office to watch over the doctrines and conduct of ministers—account of their origin—another part of their office to meet the ministers of the church, and to confer and exhort for religious good—none of them to meddle at these conferences with the government of the church.

I mentioned in the preceding chapter, as the reader must have observed, that certain persons, called Elders, watched over those, who came forward in the ministry, with a view of ascertaining if they had received a proper qualification or call; I shall now state who the elders are, as well as more particularly the nature of their office.

To every particular meeting certain elders, both men and women, sometimes more in number and sometimes less, according as persons can be found qualified, are appointed. These are nominated by a committee appointed by the monthly meeting, in conjunction with a committee appointed by the quarterly meeting. And as the office annexed to the name of elder is considered peculiarly important by the Society, particular care is taken that persons of clear discernment, and such as excel in the spiritual ear, and such as are blameless in their lives, are appointed to it. It is recommended, that neither wealth nor age be allowed to operate as inducements in the choice of them. Indeed, so much care is required to be taken with respect to the filling up of this office, that, if persons perfectly suitable are not to be found, the meetings are to be left without them.

It is one part of the duty of the elders, when appointed, to watch over the spiritual authority and doctrine of young ministers, and also to watch over the doctrine and conduct of ministers generally, and tenderly to advise with such as appear to them to be deficient in any of the qualifications, which belong to their high calling.

When we consider that every religious society attaches a more than common respectability to the person, who performs the sacerdotal office, there will be no difficulty in supposing, whenever a minister may be thought to err, that many of those, who are aware of his error, will want the courage to point it out to him, and that others

will excuse themselves from doing it, by saying that interference on this occasion does not belong more immediately to them than to others. This institution therefore of elders fixes the office on individuals. It makes it their duty to watch and advise. It makes them responsible for communications not spiritually authorized, for unsound doctrine, and the bad conduct, of their ministers. And this responsibility is considered as likely to give persons that courage, in watching over the ministry, which they might otherwise want. Hence, if a minister in the Quaker-church were to preach without proper spiritual authority, or unsoundly, or to act inconsistently with his calling, he would be generally sure of being privately spoken to by one or more of the elders.

This office of elders, as far as it is concerned in advising ministers of the Gospel, had its foundation laid by George Fox. Many persons, who engaged in the ministry in his time, are described by him as "having run into imaginations, or as having gone beyond their measure;" and in these cases, whenever they should happen, he recommended that one or two friends, if they saw fit, should advise with them in love and wisdom. In process of time, however, this evil seems to have increased; for as the Society spread, numbers pressed forward to become Gospel-ministers. Many supposed that they had a call from the Spirit, and rose up and preached, and, in the heat of their imaginations, delivered themselves unprofitably. Two or three persons also, in the phrensy of their enthusiasm, rose up occasionally, and spoke at the same time. Now this was easily to be done in a religious society where all were allowed to speak, and where the qualifications of ministers were to be judged of in part by the truths delivered, or rather, where ordination was no mark of the ministry, or where an human appointment of it was unknown. For these reasons that mode of superintendence, which had only been suggested by George Fox, and left to the discretion of individuals, was perfected into an establishment, out of imperious necessity, in after times. Men were appointed to determine between the effects of divine inspiration and human imagination; to judge between the cool and sound, and the enthusiastic and defective; and to put a bridle as it were upon those, who were not likely to become profitable laborers in the harvest of the Gospel. And as this office was rendered necessary on account of the principle, that "no ordination or human appointment could make a minister of the Gospel," so, the same principle continuing among the Quakers, the office has been continued to the present day.

It devolves upon the elders again, as a second branch of their duty, to meet the ministers of the church at stated seasons, generally once

in three months, and to spend some time with them in religious retirement. It is supposed that opportunities may be afforded here of encouraging and strengthening young ministers, of comforting the old, and of giving religious advice and assistance in various ways; and it must be supposed, at any rate, that religious men cannot meet in religious conference without some edification to each other. At these meetings queries are proposed relative to the conduct both of ministers and elders, which they answer in writing to the quarterly meetings of ministers and elders, to which they belong. Of the ministers and elders thus assembled it may be observed, that it is their duty to confine themselves wholly to the exhortation of one another for good. They can make no laws, like the ancient synods and other convocations of the clergy, nor dictate any article of faith. Neither can they meddle with the government of the church. The Quakers allow neither ministers nor elders, by virtue of their office, to interfere with their discipline. Every proposition of this sort must be determined upon by the yearly meeting, or by the body at large.

CHAPTER XII.

SECTION I.

Worship—consists of prayer and preaching—neither of these effectual but by the Spirit—hence no liturgy or form of words, or studied sermons in the Quaker-church—Singular manner of delivering sermons—Tone of the voice usually censured—this may arise from the difference between nature and art—Objected, that there is little variety of subject in these sermons—variety not so necessary to Quakers—Other objections—Replies—Observations of Francis Lambert of Avignon.

As no person, in the opinion of the members of this Society, can be a true minister of the Gospel, unless he feels himself called or appointed by the Spirit of God, so there can be no true or effectual worship, unless it come through the aid of the same Spirit.

The public worship of God is usually made to consist of prayer and of preaching.

Prayer is a solemn address of the soul to God. It is a solemn confession of some weakness, or thanksgiving for some benefit, or petition for some favor. But the Quakers consider such an address as deprived of life and power, unless it be spiritually conceived. "For the Spirit helpeth our infirmities. For we know not what we should

pray for as we ought. But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings, which cannot be uttered*."

Preaching, on the other hand, is an address of man to men, that their attention may be turned towards God, and their minds be prepared for the secret and heavenly touches of his Spirit. But this preaching, again, cannot be effectually performed, unless the Spirit of God accompany it. Thus St. Paul, in speaking of himself, says: "And my speech and my preaching were not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and with power, that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God†." So the Quakers believe, that no words, however excellent, which men may deliver now, will avail, or will produce that faith which is to stand, except they be accompanied by that power, which shall demonstrate them to be of God.

From hence it appears to be the opinion of the Society, that the whole worship of God, whether it consist of prayer or of preaching, must be spiritual. Jesus Christ has also, they say, left this declaration upon record, that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in truth‡." By worshipping him in truth they mean, that men are to worship him only when they feel a right disposition to do it, and in such a manner as they judge, from their own internal feelings, to be the manner, which the Spirit of God then signifies.

For these reasons, when they enter into their meetings, they use no liturgy or form of prayer. Such a form would be made up of the words of man's wisdom. Neither do they deliver any sermons that have been previously conceived or written down. Neither do they begin their service immediately after they are seated. But when they sit down they wait in silence§, as the Apostles were commanded to do. They endeavor to be calm and composed. They take no thought as to what they shall say. They endeavor to avoid, on the other hand, all activity of the imagination, and every thing that rises from the will of man. The creature is thus brought to be passive, and the spiritual faculty to be disencumbered, so that it can receive and attend to the spiritual language of the Creator||. If

* Rom. viii. 26.
† 1 Cor. ii. 4.
‡ John iv. 24.
§ Mat. x. 19. Acts i. 4.

|| They believe it their duty (to speak in the Quaker language) to maintain the Watch, by preserving the imagination from being carried away by thoughts originating in man; and, in such watch, patiently to await for the arising of that life which, by subduing the thoughts, imaginations, and desires of man, produces an inward silence, and therein bestows a true sight of his condition upon him, giving him to discern his frailties, to feel his spirit humbled, his spiritual wants supplied, and acceptable worship to prevail in Spirit and in truth.

during this vacation from all mental activity, no impressions should be given to them, they say nothing. If impressions should be afforded to them, but no impulse to oral delivery, they remain equally silent. But if, on the other hand, impressions are given to them with an impulse to utterance, they deliver to the congregation, as faithfully as they can, the copies of the several images, which they conceive to be painted upon their minds.

This utterance, when it manifests itself, is resolvable into prayer or preaching. If the minister engages in prayer, he kneels, and the whole company rise up, and the men with the minister take off their hats, that is, uncover their heads*. If he preaches only, they do not rise, but remain upon their seats as before, with their heads covered. The preacher, however, uncovers his head upon this occasion and stands.

There is something singular in the manner in which the Quakers deliver themselves when they preach. In the beginning of their discourses they generally utter their words with slowness, indeed with a slowness, which sometimes renders their meaning almost unintelligible to persons unaccustomed to such a mode of delivery; for seconds sometimes elapse between the soundings of short sentences or single words, so that the mind cannot easily carry the first words, and join them to the intermediate, and connect them with the last. As they proceed, they communicate their impressions in a brisker manner; till, at length, getting beyond the quickness of ordinary delivery, they may be said to utter them rapidly. At this time many of them appear to be much affected, and even agitated by their subject. This method of a very slow and deliberate pronunciation at first, and of an accelerated one afterwards, appears to me, as far as I have seen or heard, to be universal: for though undoubtedly some may make less pauses between the introductory words and sentences than others, yet all begin slower than they afterwards proceed.

This singular custom may be probably accounted for in the following manner: The Quakers certainly believe that the Spirit of God furnishes them with impressions on these occasions, but that the description of these is left to themselves. Hence a faithful watch must be kept, that these may be delivered to their hearers conformably to what is delivered to them. But if so, it may perhaps be more necessary to be more watchful at the outset, in order to ascertain the dimensions as it were of these impressions, and of their several tendencies and bearings, than afterwards, when such a knowledge of them has been obtained. Or it may be that ministers, who go wholly unprepared to preach, have but a small view of the sub-

* 1 Cor. chap. xi.

ject at first. Hence they speak slowly. But as their views are enlarged their speech becomes quickened, and their feelings become interested with it. These, for anything I know, may be solutions, upon Quaker-principles, of this extraordinary practice.

Against the preaching of the Quakers an objection is usually made by the world; namely, that their ministers generally deliver their doctrines with an unpleasant tone. But it may be observed that this, which is considered to be a defect, is by no means confined to this Society. Persons, of other religious denominations, who exert themselves in the ministry, are liable to the same charge. It may be observed also, that the difference between the accent of the Quakers, and that of the speakers of the world, may arise in the difference between art and nature. The person, who prepares his lecture for the lecture-room, or his sermon for the pulpit, studies the formation of his sentences, which are to be accompanied by a certain modulation of the voice. This modulation is artificial, for it is usually taught. The members of this Society, on the other hand, neither prepare their discourses, nor vary their voices purposely according to the rules of art. The tone which comes out, and which appears disagreeable to those who are not used to it, is nevertheless not unnatural. It is rather the mode of speaking, which nature imposes in any violent exertion of the voice, to save the lungs. Hence persons, who have their wares to cry, and this almost every other minute in the streets, are obliged to adopt a tone. Hence persons, with disordered lungs, can sing words with more ease to themselves than they can utter them with a similar pitch of the voice. Hence Quaker-women, when they preach, have generally more of this tone than the men, for the lungs of the female are generally weaker than those of the other sex.

Against the sermons of the Quakers two objections are usually made; the first of which is, that they contain but little variety of subject. Among dissenters, it is said, but more particularly in the establishment, that you may hear fifty sermons following each other, where the subject of each is different. Hence a man, ignorant of letters, may collect all his moral and religious duties from the pulpit in the course of the year. But this variety, it is contended, is not to be found in the Quaker-church.

That there is less variety in the sermons now under consideration, than in those of others there can be no doubt. But such variety is not necessary to Quakers, on account of their peculiar tenets and the universality of their education, as to others. For it is believed, as I have explained before, that the Spirit of God, if duly attended to, is a spiritual guide to man, and that it leads him into all truth; that it

redeems him, and that it qualifies him therefore for happiness in a future state. Thus an injunction to attend to the teachings of the Spirit supersedes, in some measure, the necessity of detailing the moral and religious obligations of individuals. And this necessity is still further superseded by the consideration, that, as all the members of the Society can read, they can collect their Christian duty from the Scriptures, independently of their own ministers; or that they can collect those duties for themselves, which others, who are illiterate, are obliged to collect from the church.

The second objection is, that their discourses have generally less in them, and are occasionally less connected or more confused than those of others.

It must be obvious, when we consider that the Quaker ministers are often persons of but little erudition, and that their principles forbid them to premeditate on these occasions, that we can hardly expect to find the same logical division of the subject, or the same logical provings of given points, as in the sermons of those, who spend hours or even days together in composing them.

With respect to the apparent barrenness, or the little matter sometimes discoverable in their sermons, they would reply, that God has not given to every man a similar or equal gift. To some he has given largely; to others in a less degree. Upon some he has bestowed gifts that may edify the learned, upon others such as may edify the illiterate. Men are not to limit his Spirit by their own notions of qualification. Like the wind, it bloweth not only where it listeth, but as it listeth. Thus, preaching, which may appear to a scholar as below the ordinary standard, may be more edifying to the simple-hearted than a discourse better delivered or more eruditely expressed. Thus again preaching, which may be made up of high-sounding words, and of a mechanical manner, and an affected tone, and which may, on these accounts, please the man of learning and taste, may be looked upon as dross by a man of moderate abilities or acquirements. And thus it has happened, that many have left the orators of the world and joined the Quaker-society, on account of the barrenness of the discourses, which they have heard among them.

With respect to their sermons being sometimes less connected or more confused than those of others, they would admit that this might apparently happen, and they would explain it in the following manner: Their ministers, they would say, when they sit among the congregation, are often given to feel or discern the spiritual states of individuals then present, and sometimes to believe it necessary to describe such states, and to add such advice as these may seem to require. Now these states being frequently very different from

each other, the description of them, in consequence of an abrupt transition from one to the other, may sometimes occasion an apparent inconsistency in their discourses on such occasions. The Quakers, however, consider all such discourses, or those in which states are described, as among the most efficacious and useful of those delivered.

But whatever may be the merits of the Quaker-sermons, there are circumstances worthy of notice with respect to the Quaker-preachers. In the first place, they always deliver their discourses with great seriousness. They are also singularly bold and honest, when they feel it to be their duty, in the censure of the vices of individuals, whatever may be the riches they enjoy. They are reported also, from unquestionable authority, to have extraordinary skill in discerning the internal condition of those, who attend their ministry; so that many, feeling their advice to be addressed to themselves, have resolved upon amendment in the several cases, to which their preaching seemed to be applied.

As I am speaking upon the subject of ministers, I will answer one or two questions, which I have often heard asked concerning it.

The first of these is, Do the members of this Society believe that their ministers are uniformly moved, when they preach, by the Spirit of God?

I answer, They believe they may be so moved, and that they ought to be so moved. They believe also, that they are often so moved. But they believe again, that except their ministers be peculiarly cautious, and keep particularly on their watch, they may mistake their own imaginations for the agency of this Spirit. And upon this latter belief it is, in part, that the office of elders is founded, as before described.

The second is, As there are no defined boundaries between the reason of man and the revelation of God, how do the Quakers know that they are favored at any particular time, either when they preach, or when they do not preach, with the visitation of this Spirit, or that it is, at any particular time, a resident within them?

Richard Claridge, a learned and pious clergyman of the Church of England in the last century, but who gave up his benefices, and joined in membership with this Society, has said a few words, in his Tractatus Hierographicus, upon this subject, a part of which I shall transcribe as an answer to this latter question.

"Men," says he, "may certainly know, that they do believe on the Son of God, with that faith which is unfeigned, and by which the heart is purified; for this faith is evidential, and assuring, and consequently the knowledge of it is certain. Now they, who certainly

know that they have this knowledge, may be certain also of the Spirit of Christ dwelling in them; for 'he that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself*;' and this witness is the Spirit; for 'it is the Spirit that beareth witness†;' of whose testimony they may be as certain, as of that faith the Spirit beareth witness to."

Again: "They may certainly know that they love the Lord above all, and their neighbor as themselves. For the command implies not only a possibility of knowing it in general, but also of such a knowledge as respects their own immediate concernment therein, and personal benefit arising from a sense of their conformity and obedience thereunto. And seeing they may certainly know this, they may also as certainly know that the Spirit of Christ dwelleth in them, for 'God is Love; and he that dwelleth in Love dwelleth in God, and God in him‡.' And 'if we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us‖.'" In the same manner he goes on to enumerate many other marks from texts of Scripture by which he conceives the question may be determined§.

I shall conclude this chapter on the subject of the Quaker-preaching, by an extract from Francis Lambert, of Avignon, whose book was published in the year 1516, long before the Society of the Quakers took its rise in the world. "Beware," says he, "that thou determine not precisely to speak what before thou hast meditated, whatsoever it be; for though it be lawful to determine the text which thou art to expound, yet not at all the interpretation; lest, if thou doest so, thou takest from the Holy Spirit that which is his; namely, to direct thy speech, that thou mayest preach in the name of the Lord, void of all learning, meditation, and experience, and as if thou hadst studied nothing at all, committing thy heart, thy tongue, and thyself wholly unto his Spirit, and trusting nothing to thy former studying or meditation, but saying to thyself, in great confidence of the divine promise, The Lord will give a word with much power unto those that preach the Gospel."

---

* 1 John v. 10. † 1 John v. 6.

‡ 1 John iv. 16. ‖ 1 John iv. 12.

§ The Quakers conceive it to be no more difficult for them to distinguish the motions of the Holy Spirit, than for those of the Church of England, who are candidates for holy orders. Every such candidate is asked, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration?" The answer is, "I trust so."

SECTION II.

But besides oral or vocal, there is silent worship among the Quakers—many meetings, where not a word is said, and yet worship is considered to have begun and to be proceeding—worship not necessarily connected with words—this the opinion of other pious men besides Quakers—of Howe—Hales—Gell—Smaldridge, bishop of Bristol—Monro—Advantages which the Quakers attach to their silent worship.

I have hitherto confined myself to those meetings of the Society where the minister is said to have received impressions from the Spirit of God with a desire of expressing them, and where, if he expresses them, he ought to deliver them to the congregation as the pictures of his will, and this as accurately as the mirror represents the object that is set before it. There are times, however, as I mentioned in the last section, when either no impressions may be said to be felt, or, if any are felt, there is no concomitant impulse to utter them. In this case, no person attempts to speak; for to speak or to pray where the heart feels no impulse to do it, would be, in the opinion of the Quakers, to mock God, and not to worship him in Spirit and in truth. They sit therefore in silence, and worship in silence*. And they not only remain silent the whole time of their meetings, but many meetings take place, and these sometimes in succession, when not a word is uttered.

Michael de Molinos, who was chief of the sect of the Quietists, and whose "Spiritual Guide" was printed at Venice in 1685, speaks thus: "There are three kinds of silence; the first is of words, the second of desires, and the third of thoughts. The first is excellent; the second is more excellent; and the third is most excellent. In the first, that is of words, virtue is acquired. In the second, namely, of desires, quietness is attained. In the third, of thoughts, internal recollection is gained. By not speaking, not desiring, and not thinking, one arrives at the true and perfect mystical silence, where God speaks with the soul, communicates himself to it, and in the abyss of its own depth teaches the most perfect and exalted wisdom."

Many people of other religious societies, if they were to visit the meetings of the Quakers, while under their silent worship, would be apt to consider the congregation as little better than stocks or stones, or at any rate as destitute of that† life and animation, which con-

---

* See note ‖, page 271, in the preceding Section.

† Some, however, of other religious societies have been particularly struck with the solemnity of such meetings.

stitute the essence of religion. They would have no idea that a eople were worshipping God, whom they observed to deliverd nothing from their lips. It does not follow, however, because nothing is said, that God is not worshipped. The Quakers, on the other hand, contend that these silent meetings form the sublimest part of their worship. The soul, they say, can have intercourse with God. It can feel refreshment, joy, and comfort in him; it can praise and adore him, and all this without the intervention of a word.

This power of the soul is owing to its constitution or nature. "It follows," says the learned Howe, in his Living Temple, "that having formed this his more excellent creature, according to his own more express likeness, stamped it with the more glorious characters of his living image, given it a nature suitable to his own, and thereby made it capable of rational and intelligent converse with him, he hath it ever in his power to maintain a continual converse with his creature, by agreeable communications, by letting in upon it the vital beams and influences of his own light and love, and receiving back the return of its grateful acknowledgments and praises. Wherein it is manifest he should do no greater thing than he hath done. For who sees not that it is a matter of no greater difficulty to converse with than to make a reasonable creature? Or who would not be ashamed to deny that he, who hath been the only author of the soul of man, and of the excellent powers and faculties belonging to it, can more easily sustain that which he hath made, and converse with his creature suitably to the way wherein he hath made it capable of his converse?"

That worship may exist without the intervention of words, on account of this constitution of the soul, is a sentiment which has been espoused by many pious persons who were not of this Society. Thus the learned and virtuous John Hales, in his Golden Remains, expresses himself: "Nay, one thing I know more; that the prayer, which is the most forcible, transcends, and far exceeds all power of words. For St. Paul, speaking unto us of the most effectual kind of prayer, calls it sighs and groans, that cannot be expressed. Nothing cries so loud in the ears of God as the sighing of a contrite and earnest heart."

"It requires not the voice, but the mind; not the stretching of the hands, but the intension of the heart; not any outward shape or carriage of the body, but the inward behavior of the understanding. How then can it slacken your worldly business and occasions, to mix them with sighs and groans, which are the most effectual kind of prayer."

Dr. Gell, before quoted, says: "Words, conceived only in an earthly mind, and uttered out of the memory by man's voice, which make a noise in the ears of flesh and blood, are not, nor can be, accounted a prayer, before our Father which is in Heaven."

Dr. Smaldridge, bishop of Bristol, has the following expressions in his Sermons: "Prayer doth not consist either in the bending of our knees, or the service of our lips, or the lifting up of our hands or eyes to heaven; but in the elevation of our souls towards God. These outward expressions of our inward thoughts are necessary in our public, and often expedient in our private devotions; but they do not make up the essence of prayer, which may truly and acceptably be performed, where these are wanting."

And he says afterwards, in other parts of his work, "Devotion of mind is itself a silent prayer, which wants not to be clothed in words, that God may better know our desires. He regards not the service of our lips, but the inward disposition of our hearts."

Monro, before quoted, speaks to the same effect in his Just Measures of the Pious Institutions of Youth: "The breathings of a recollected soul are not noise or clamor. The language, in which devotion loves to vent itself is that of the inward man, which is secret and silent, but yet God hears it, and makes gracious returns unto it. Sometimes the pious ardors and sensations of good souls are such as they cannot clothe with words. They feel what they cannot express. I would not, however, be thought to insinuate that the voice and words are not to be used at all. It is certain that public and common devotions cannot be performed without them; and that, even in private, they are not only very profitable, but sometimes necessary. What I here aim at is, that the youth should be made sensible that words are not otherwise valuable, than as they are images and copies of what passes in the hidden man of the heart; especially considering that a great many, who appear very angelical in their devotions, if we take our measures of them from their voice and tone, do soon, after these intervals of seeming seriousness are over, return with the dog to the vomit, and give palpable evidences of their earthliness and sensuality, their passion and their pride."

Again: "I am persuaded," says he, "that it would be vastly advantageous for the youth, if care were taken to train them up to this method of prayer; that is, if they were taught frequently to place themselves in the divine presence, and there silently to adore their Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. For hereby they would become habitually recollected. Devotion would be their element; and they would know by experience, what our blessed Savior and

his great apostle meant, when they enjoin us to pray without ceasing. It was, I suppose, by some such method of devotion as I am now speaking of, that Enoch walked with God; that Moses saw him that is invisible; that the royal psalmist set the Lord always before him; and that our Lord Jesus himself continued whole nights in prayer to God. No man, I believe, will imagine this his prayer, during all the space in which it is said to have continued, was altogether vocal. When he was in his agony in the garden, he used but a few words. His vocal prayer then consisted only of one petition, and an act of pure resignation thrice repeated. But I hope all will allow that his devotion lasted longer than while he was employed in the uttering of a few sentences."

These meetings then, which are usually denominated Silent, and in which, though not a word be spoken, it appears from the testimony of others that God may be truly worshipped, the Quakers consider as an important and sublime part of their church-service, and as possessing advantages which are not to be found in the worship, which proceeds solely through the medium of the mouth.

For, in the first place, it must be obvious, that in these silent meetings men cannot become chargeable before God, either with hypocrisy or falsehood, by pretending to worship him with their lips, when their affections are far from him, or by uttering a language, that is inconsistent with the feelings of the heart.

It must be obvious again, that every man's devotion, in these silent meetings, is made as it ought to be, to depend upon himself; for no man can work out the salvation of another for him. A man does not depend at these times on the words of a minister, or of any other person present; but his own soul, worked on by the divine influence, pleads in silence with the Almighty its own cause. And thus, by extending this idea to the congregation at large, we shall find a number of individuals offering up at the same time their own several confessions, pouring out their own several petitions, giving their own thanks severally, or praising and adoring, all of them, in different languages adapted to their several conditions, and yet not interrupting one another.

Nor is it the least recommendation of this worship, in the opinion of the Society, that, being thus wholly spiritual, it is out of the power of the natural man to obstruct it. No man can break the chain, that thus binds the spirit of man to the Spirit of God; for this chain, which is spiritual, is invisible. But this is not the case, the Quakers say, with any oral worship. "For how," says Barclay, alluding to his own times, "can the Papists say their mass, if there be any there to disturb and interrupt them? Do but take

away the mass-book, the chalice, the host, or the priests' garments; yea, do but spill the water, or the wine, or blow out the candles (a thing quickly to be done), and the whole business is marred, and no sacrifice can be offered. Take from the Lutherans and Episcopaleans their liturgy, or common prayer-book, and no service can be said. Remove from the Calvinists, Arminians, Socinians, Independents, or Anabaptists, the pulpit, the bible, and the hour-glass, or make but such a noise as the voice of the preacher cannot be heard, or disturb him but so before he come, or strip him of his bible, or his books, and he must be dumb: for they all think it a heresy to wait to speak, as the Spirit of God giveth utterance; and thus easily their whole worship may be marred."

SECTION III.

Quakers reject everything ostentatious and spiritless from their worship—Ground on which their meeting-houses stand not consecrated—the latter plain—Women sit apart from the men—no pews—nor priests' garments—nor psalmody—no one day thought more holy than another—but as public worship is necessary, days have been fixed upon for that purpose.

Jesus Christ, as he was sitting at Jacob's Well, and talking with the woman of Samaria, made use of the following among other expressions in his discourse. "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the father. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth."

These expressions the Quakers generally render thus: I tell you that a new dispensation is at hand. Men will no longer worship at Jerusalem, more acceptably than in any other place. Neither will it be expected of them that they shall worship in temples, like the temple there. Neither the glory, nor the ornaments of gold and silver, and precious stones, nor the splendid garments of the high-priest, will be any parts of the new worship that is approaching. All ceremonies will be done away, and men's religion will be reduced simply to the worshipping of God in Spirit and in truth. In short, they believe that when Jesus Christ came, he ended the temple, its ornaments, its music, its Levitical priesthood, its tithes, its new moons and sabbaths, and the various ceremonial ordinances, that had been engrafted into the religion of the Jews.

The Quakers reject everything that appears to them to be superstitious, or formal, or ceremonious, or ostentatious, or spiritless from their worship.

They believe that no ground can be made holy; and therefore they

do not allow the places, on which their meeting-houses are built, to be consecrated by any human forms.

Their meeting-houses are singularly plain. There is nothing of decoration in the interior of them. They consist of a number of plain long benches with backs to them. There is one elevated seat at the end of these. This seat is for their ministers. It is elevated for no other reason, than that their ministers may be the better heard.

The women occupy one-half of these benches, and sit apart from the men.

The benches are not intersected by partitions. Hence there are no distinct pews for the families of the rich, or of such as can afford to pay for them; for, in the first place, the Quakers pay nothing for their seats in their meeting-houses; and in the second, they pay no respect to the outward condition of one another. If they consider themselves when out of doors as all equal to one another in point of privileges, much more do they abolish all distinctions, when professedly in a place of worship. They sit therefore in their meeting-houses undistinguished with respect to their outward circumstances*, as the children of the same great Parent, who stand equally in need of his assistance, and as in the sight of Him, who is no respecter of persons, but who made of one blood all the nations of men, who dwell on all the face of the earth.

The Quaker-ministers are not distinguishable when in their places of worship by their dress. They wear neither black clothes, nor surplices, nor gowns, nor bands. Jesus Christ, when he preached to the multitude, is not recorded to have put on a dress different from that, which he wore on other occasions. Neither do the Quakers believe that ministers of the Church ought, under the new dispensation, to be a separate people, as the Levites were, or to be distinguished on account of their office from other men.

The members of this Society differ from other Christians in the rejection of psalmody, as a service of the Church. If persons feel themselves so influenced in their private devotions, "that they can sing," as the apostle says, "with the Spirit and the understanding†," or can "sing and make melody in their hearts to the Lord‡;" the Quakers have no objection to this as an act of worship. But they conceive that music and psalmody, though they might have been adapted to the ceremonial religion of the Jews, are not congenial with the new dispensation that has followed: because this dispensa-

*Spiritual officers, such as Elders and Overseers, sit at the upper end of the meeting-house.

† 1 Cor. xiv. 15. ‡ Ephes. v. 19.

tion requires, that all worship should be performed in Spirit and in Truth. It requires that no act of religion should take place, unless the Spirit influences an utterance, and that no words should be used, except they are in unision with the heart. Now this coincidence of spiritual impulse and feeling with this act is not likely to happen, in the opinion of the Society, with public psalmody. It is not likely, that all in the congregation will be impelled, in the same moment, to a spiritual song, or that all will be in the state of mind or spirit, which the words of the Psalm describe. Thus, how few will be able to sing truly with David, if the following verse should be brought before them: "As the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God!" To this it may be added, that where men think about musical harmony, or vocal tunes, in their worship, the amusement of the creature will be so mixed with it, that it can not be a pure oblation of the Spirit; and that those, who think they can please the Divine Being by musical instruments, or the varied modulations of their own voices, must look upon him as a being with corporeal organs, sensible, like a man, of fleshly delights—and not as a Spirit, who can only be pleased with the worship that is in Spirit and in Truth.

They reject also the consecration and solemnization of particular days and times. As the Jews, when they became Christians, were enjoined by the apostle Paul not to put too great a value upon "days, and months, and times, and years*," so the Quakers think it their duty, as Christians, to attend to the same injunction. They never meet upon saints' days, as such, that is, as days demanding the religious assemblings of men, more than others; first, because they conceive this would be giving into popish supersition; and, secondly, because these days were originally the appointment of men, and not of God; and no human appointment, they believe, can make one day holier than another.

For the latter reason, also, they do not assemble for worship on those days, which their own government, though they are particularly attached to it, appoint as fasts. They are influenced also by another reason in this latter case. They conceive, as religion is of a spiritual nature, and must depend upon the Spirit of God, that true devotion cannot be excited for given purposes, or at a given time. They are influenced again by the consideration, that the real fast is of a different nature from that required. "Is not this the fast," says Isaiah†, "that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that

* Gal. iv. 10. † Isaiah lviii. 6, 7.

ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor, that are cast out, to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thy own flesh?" This the Quakers believe to be the true fast, and not the work of a particular day, but to be the daily work of every real Christian.

Indeed, no one day, in the estimation of this people, can be made by human appointment either more holy or more proper for worship than another. They do not even believe that the Jewish Sabbath, which was by the appointment of God, continues in Gospel-times, or that it has been handed down by divine authority as the true Sabbath of Christians. All days with the members of this Society are equally holy, and all equally proper for the worship of God. In this opinion they coincide with the ever-memorable John Hales. "For prayer, indeed," says this venerable man, "was the Sabbath ordained. Yet prayer itself is sabbathless, and admits of no rest, no intermission at all. If our hands be clean, we must, as our apostle commands us, lift them up every where, at all times, and make every place a church, every day a sabbath-day, every hour canonical. As you go to the market, as you stand in the streets, as you walk in the fields, —in all these places, you may pray as well, and with as good acceptance, as in the church; for you yourselves are temples of the Holy Ghost, if the Grace of God be in you, more precious than any of those which are made with hands."

Though, however, the Quakers believe no one day in the sight of God to be holier than another, and no one capable of being rendered so by human authority, yet they think that Christians ought to assemble for the public worship of God. They think they ought to bear an outward and public testimony for God; and this can only be done by becoming members of a visible church, where they may be seen to acknowledge him publicly in the face of men. They think also, that the public worship of God increases, as it were, the fire of devotion, and enlarges the sphere of spiritual life in the souls of men. "God causes the inward life," says Barclay, "the more to abound, when his children assemble themselves diligently together to wait upon him; so that, as iron sharpeneth iron, the seeing of the faces of one another, when both are inwardly gathered unto the Life, giveth occasion for the Life secretly to rise, and to pass from vessel to vessel. And as many candles lighted, and put in one place, do greatly augment the light, and make it more to shine forth; so, when many are gathered together into the same Life, there is more of the glory of God, and his power appears to the refreshment of each individual; for that he partakes not only of the Light and Life raised in

himself, but in all the rest. And therefore Christ hath particularly promised a blessing to such as assemble in his name, seeing he will be in the midst of them." For these and other reasons, the Quakers think it proper that men should be drawn together to the public worship of God. But if so, they must be drawn together at certain times. Now as one day has never been in the eyes of the Quakers more desiradle for such an object than another, their ancestors chose the first day in the week, because the Apostles had chosen it for the religious assembling of themselves and their followers. And, in addition to this, that more frequent opportunities might be afforded tnem of bearing their outward testimony publicly for God, and of enlarging the sphere of their spiritual life; they appointed a meeting on one other day in the week in most places, and two in some others, for the same purpose.

CHAPTER XIII.

Miscellaneous particularities—Quakers careful about the use of such words as relate to religion—never use the words "Original Sin"—nor "the Word of God" for the Scriptures—nor the word "Trinity"—never pry into the latter mystery—believe in the manhood and divinity of Jesus Christ—also in a resurrection, but never attempt to fathom that subject—Make little difference between sanctification and justification—their ideas concerning the latter.

THE members of this Society are remarkably careful, both in their conversation and their writings on religious subjects, as to the terms which they use. They express scriptural images or ideas, as much as may be, by scriptural terms. By means of this particular caution they avoid much of the perplexity and many of the difficulties, which arise to others, and escape the theological disputes, which disturb the rest of the Christian world.

They scarcely ever utter the words "Original Sin," because they never find them in use in the Sacred Writings.

The Scriptures are usually denominated by Christians "the Word of God." Though the Quakers believe them to have been given by divine inspiration, yet they reject this term. They apprehend that Christ is the Word of God. They cannot therefore consistently give to the Scriptures, however they reverence them, that name which St. John the Evangelist gives exclusively to the Son of God.

Neither do they often make use of the word "Trinity." This expression they can no where find in the Sacred Writings. This to them is a sufficient warrant for rejecting it. They consider it as a term of

mere human invention, and of too late a date to claim a place among the expressions of primitive Christianity. For they find it neither in Justin Martyr, nor in Irenæus, nor in Tertullian, nor in Origen, nor in the Fathers of the three first centuries of the Church.

And as they seldom use the term, so they seldom or never try, when it offers itself to them, either in conversation or in books, to fathom its meaning. They judge that a curious inquiry into such high and speculative things, though ever so great truths in themselves, tends little to godliness, and less to peace; and that their principal concern is with that only which is clearly revealed, and which leads practically to holiness of life.

Consistently with this judgment, we find but little said respecting the Trinity by the Quaker writers.

Barclay no where notices the Trinity as a distinct subject. In speaking, however, of the Seed or Word of God, or Light with which every one is enlightened, he says, "We do not understand by this the proper essence and nature of God precisely taken, but a spiritual, heavenly, and invisible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son, and Spirit dwells." In his Catechism also he acknowleges a distinction of Father, Son, and Spirit in the Deity. From these expressions we collect his belief in a Trinity as recorded in the words of Scripture, but we obtain no particular knowledge concerning it.

In the works of William Penn we find the following passage: "We do believe in one only God Almighty, who is an eternal Spirit, the creator of all things. And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, his only Son, and express image of his substance, who took upon him flesh, and was in the world, to whose holy life, power, meditation, and blood, we only ascribe our sanctification, redemption, and perfect salvation. And we believe in one Holy Spirit, that proceeds and breathes from the Father and the Son, as the life and virtue of both the Father and the Son, a measure of which is given to all to profit with, and he that has one has all; for these three are one, who is the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, God over all blessed for ever."

In another part of his works he acknowledges again a Father, Word, and Holy Spirit: but he observes, not according to the notions of men, but according to the Scriptures; and that these three are truly and properly one, of one nature as well as will.

Isaac Pennington, an ancient Quaker, speaks thus: "That the three are distinct as three several beings or persons, the Quakers no where read in the Scriptures, but they read in them that they are one. And thus they believe their being to be one, their life one, their light one, their wisdom one, their power one. And he, that knoweth and seeth any one of them, knoweth and seeth them all, according

to that saying of Christ to Philip: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." In another place he saith: "I know three, and feel three in Spirit, even an eternal Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which are but one eternal God. And I feel them also one, and have fellowship with them in their Life, and in their redeeming Power."

John Crook, another ancient writer of this Society, in speaking of the Trinity, says that the Quakers "acknowledge one God, the Father of Jesus Christ, witnessed within man only by the Spirit of truth, and these three are one, and agree in one; and he, that honors the Father, honors the Son that proceeds from him; and he, that denies the Spirit, denies both the Father and the Son." But nothing further can be obtained from this author on this subject.

Henry Tuke, a modern writer among the Quakers, and who published an account of the principles of the Society only last year says also but little upon the point before us. "We likewise, believe," says he, "in the divinity of the Holy Spirit, which is frequently united in Scripture with the Father and with the Son; and whose office, in the instruction and salvation of mankind is set forth in divers passages in Holy Writ. This belief in the divinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, induced some of the teachers in the Christian Church, about three hundred years after Christ, to form a doctrine to which they gave the name of Trinity; but, in our writings, we seldom make use of this term, thinking it best on such a subject to keep to scriptural expressions, and to avoid those disputes, which have since perplexed the Christian world, and led into speculations beyond the power of human abilities to decide. If we consider that we ourselves are composed of an union of body, soul, and spirit, and yet cannot determine how even these are united, how much less may we expect perfect clearness on a subject so far above our finite comprehension, as that of the divine nature!"

The Quakers believe that Jesus Christ was man, because he took flesh, and inhabited the body prepared for him, and was subject to human infirmities; but they believe also in his divinity, because he was the Word.

They believe also in the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, as connected with the Christian religion. "In explaining our belief of this doctrine," says Henry Tuke, "we refer to the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. In this chapter is clearly laid down the resurrection of a body, though not of the same body that dies. "There are celestial bodies, and there are bodies terrestrial; but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.—So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; there is a

natural body, and there is a spiritual body.—Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.' Here we rest our belief in this mystery, without desiring to pry into it beyond what is revealed to us; remembering that secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things, which are revealed, belong unto us and to our children."

The Quakers make but little difference, and not such as many other Christians do, between sanctification and justification. "Faith and works," says Richard Claridge, "are both concerned in our complete justification."—"Whosoever is justified, he is also in measure sanctified; and, as far as he is sanctified, so far he is justified, and no further." "But the justification I now speak of is the making of us just or righteous by the continual help, work, and operation of the Holy Spirit."—"And as we wait for the continual help and assistance of his Holy Spirit, and come to witness the effectual working of the same in ourselves, so we shall experimentally find, that our justification is proportionable to our sanctification; for as our sanctification goes forward, which is always commensurate to our faithful obedience to the manifestation, influence and assistance, of the Grace, Light, and Spirit of Christ, so we shall always feel and perceive the process of our justification."

The ideas of the Society as to justification itself cannot be explained better than in the words of Henry Tuke, before quoted. "So far as remission of sins, and a capacity to receive salvation, are parts of justifications, we attribute it to the sacrifice of Christ, 'in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.'

"But when we consider justification as a state of divine favor and acceptance, we ascribe it, not simply either to faith or works, but to the sanctifying operation of the Spirit of Christ, from which living faith and acceptable works alone proceed; and by which we may come to know that 'the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits, that we are the children of God.'—"In attributing our justification, through the Grace of God in Christ Jesus, to the operation of the Holy Spirit which sanctifies the heart, and produces the work of regeneration, we are supported by the testimony of the apostle Paul, who says, 'Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but of his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Again: 'But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.'

"By this view of the doctrine of justification, we conceive the

apparently different sentiments of the apostles Paul and James are reconciled. Neither of them says that faith alone, or works alone, are the cause of our being justified; but as one of them asserts the necessity of faith, and the other of works, for effecting this great object, a clear and convincing proof is afforded that both contribute to our justification; and that faith without works, and works without faith, are equally dead."

CHAPTER XIV.

Quakers reject Baptism and the Lord's Supper—much censured for it—Indulgence solicited for them on account of the difficulties connected with these subjects—Christian religion spiritual—Jewish types to be abolished—Different meanings of the word "baptize"—Disputes concerning the mode of baptism—concerning also the nature and constitution of the Supper—concerning also the time and manner of its celebration—This indulgence also proper, because the Quakers give it to others who differ from them, as a body, on the subject of religion.

The Quakers, among other particularities, reject the application of Water-baptism, and the administration of the Sacrament of the Supper, as Christian rites.

These ordinances have been considered by many, as so essentially interwoven with Christianity, that the members of this Society, by rejecting the use of them, have been denied to be Christians.

But, whatever may be the difference of opinion between the world and the Quakers upon these subjects, great indulgence is due to the latter on this occasion. People have received the ordinances in question from their ancestors. They have been brought up to the use of them. They have seen them sanctioned by the world. Finding their authority disputed by a body of men, who are insignificant as to numbers when compared with others, they have let loose their censure upon them, and this without any inquiry concerning the grounds of their dissent. They know perhaps nothing of the obstinate contentions, nothing of the difficulties that have occurred, and nothing of those which may still be started on these subjects. I shall state therefore a few considerations by way of preface during which the reader will see, that objections both fair and forcible may be raised by the best disposed Christians on the other side of the question; that the path is not so plain and easy as he may have imagined it to be; and that, if persons of this denomination have taken a road different from himself on this occasion, they are entitled to a

fair hearing of all they have to say in their defence, and to expect the same candor and indulgence, which he himself would have claimed, if, with the best intentions, he had not been able to come to the same conclusion, on any given point of importance, as had been adopted by others.

Let me then ask, in the first place, What is the great characteristic of the religion we profess?

If we look to divines for an answer to this question, we may easily obtain it. We shall find some of them, in their sermons, speaking of circumcision, baptismal washings and purifications, new moons, feasts of the passover and unleavened bread, sacrifices and other rites. We shall find them dwelling on these, as constituent parts of the religion of the Jews. We shall find them immediately passing from thence to the religion of Jesus Christ. Here all is considered by them to be spiritual. Devotion of the heart is insisted upon as that alone, which is acceptable to God. If God is to be worshipped, it is laid down as a position, that he is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. We shall find them also, in other of their sermons, but particularly in those preached after the Reformation, stating the advantages obtained by that event. The Roman Catholic system is here considered by them to be as ceremonial as that of the Jews. The Protestant is held out as of a more spiritual nature, and as more congenial therefore with the spirit of the Gospel. But what is this but a confession, in each case, that in proportion as men give up ceremonies, and become spiritual in their worship, their religion is the best; or that spirituality is the grand characteristic of the religion of Jesus Christ? Now there immediately arises a presumption, if spirituality of feeling had been intended as the characteristic of any religion, that no ceremonious ordinances would have been introduced into it.

If, again, I were to make an assertion to divines, that Jesus Christ came to put an end to the ceremonious part of the Jewish Law, and to the types and shadows belonging to the Jewish dispensation, they would not deny it. But Baptism and the Supper were both of them outward Jewish ceremonies, connected with the Jewish religion. They were both of them types and shadows, of which the antitypes and substances had been realized at the death of Christ. And therefore a presumption arises again, that these were not intended to be continued.

And that they were not intended to be continued, may be presumed again from another consideration. For, what was baptism to any but a Jew? What could a Gentile have understood by it? What notion could he have formed, by means of it, of the necessity of the baptism of Christ? Unacquainted with purifications by water, as

symbols of purification of heart, he could never have entered like a Jew, into the spiritual life of such an ordinance. And similar observations may be made with respect to the Passover-supper. A Gentile could have known nothing, like a Jew, of the meaning of this ceremony. He could never have seen in the Paschal lamb any type of Christ, or in the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage any type of his own deliverance from sin, so clearly and feelingly as if the facts and customs had related to his own history, or as if he had been trained to the connection by a long series of prophesies. In short, the Passover could have had but little meaning to him. From these circumstances, therefore, there would be reason to conclude that these ceremonies were not to be continued, at least to any but Jews, because they were not fitted to the knowledge, the genius, or the condition of the Gentile world.

But independently of these difficulties, which arise from a general view of these ordinances as annexed to a religion, which is confessed to be spiritual, others arise from a particular view of each. On the subject of Baptism, there is ground for argument as to the meaning of the word "baptize." This word, in consequence of its representation of a watery ceremony, is usually connected with water in our minds. But it may also very consistently be connected even with fire. Its general meaning is to purify. In this sense many understand it: and those who do, and who apply it to the great command of Jesus to his disciples, think they give a better interpretation of it than those who connect it with water; for they think it more reasonable that the Apostles should have been enjoined to go into all nations, and to endeavor to purify the hearts of individuals, by the spirit and power of their preaching, from the dross of heathen notions, and to lead them to spirituality of mind, by the inculcation of Gospel-principles, than to dip them under water, as an essential part of their new religion.

But on a supposition that the word "baptize" should signify to immerse, and not to purify, another difficulty occurs; for, if it was thought proper or necessary that persons should be initiated into Christianity by water-baptism, in order to distinguish their new state from that of the Jews or Heathens, who then surrounded them, it seems unnecessary for the children of Christian parents, who were born in a Christian community, and whose ancestors for centuries have professed the Christian name.

Nor is it to be considered as any other than a difficulty. that the Christian world have known so little about water-baptism, that they have been divided as to the right manner of performing it. The Eastern and Western churches differed early upon this point; and

Christians continue to differ upon it to the present day, some thinking that none but adults, others that none but infants, should be baptized; some that the faces only of the baptized should be sprinkled with water; others, that their bodies should be immersed.

On the subject of the Sacrament of the Supper, similar difficulties have occurred.

Jesus Christ unquestionably permitted his disciples to meet together, in remembrance of their last supper with him. But it is not clear that this was any other than a permission to those only who were present, and who had known and loved him. The Disciples were not ordered to go into all nations, and to enjoin it to their converts to observe the same ceremony. Neither did the Apostles leave any command, by which it was enjoined as an ordinance of the Christian Church.

Another difficulty, which has arisen on the subject of the Supper, is, that Christians seem so little to have understood the nature of it, or in what it consisted, that they have had, in different ages, different views, and encouraged different doctrines concerning it. One has placed it in one thing, and another in another. Most of them, again, have attempted, in their explanation of it, to blend the enjoyment of the spiritual essence with that of the corporeal substance of the body and blood of Christ, and thus to unite a spiritual with a ceremonial exercise of religion. Grasping therefore at things apparently irreconcileable, they have conceived the strangest notions; and, by giving these to the world, they have only afforded fuel for contention among themselves and others.

In the time of the Apostles it was the custom of converted persons, grounded on the circumstances that passed at the supper of the Passover, to meet in religious communion. They used on these occasions to break their bread, and take their refreshment, and converse together. The object of these meetings was to imitate the last friendly supper of Jesus with his disciples, to bear a public memorial of his sufferings and of his death, and to promote their love for one another. But this custom was nothing more, as far as evidence can be had, than that of a brotherly breaking of their bread together. It was no sacramental eating. Neither was the body of Jesus supposed to be enjoyed, nor the spiritual enjoyment of it to consist in the partaking of this outward feast.

In process of time, after the days of the Apostles, when this simple custom had declined, we find another meeting of Christians in imitation of that at the Passover-supper, at which both bread and wine were introduced. This different commemoration of the same event had a new name given to it, for it was distinguished from the other by h e name of Eucharist.

Alexander, the seventh bishop of Rome, who introduced holy water both into houses and churches for spiritual purposes, made some alterations in the ingredients of the Eucharist, by mixing water with the wine, and by substituting unleavened for common bread.

In the time of Irenæus, and Justin the Martyr, we find an account of the Eucharist as it was then thought of and celebrated. Great stress was then laid upon the bread and wine, as a holy and sacramental repast. Prayers were made that the Holy Ghost would descend into each of these substances. It was believed that it did so descend; and that, as soon as the bread and wine perceived it, the former operated virtually as the body, and the latter as the blood, of Jesus Christ. From this time the bread was considered to have great virtues; and on this latter account, not only children but sucking infants were admitted to this sacrament. It was also given to persons on the approach of death. And many afterwards, who had great voyages to make at sea, carried it with them to preserve them both from temporal and spiritual dangers.

In the twelfth century, another notion, a little modified from the former, prevailed upon this subject; which was, that consecration by a priest had the power of abolishing the substance of the bread, and of substituting the very body of Jesus Christ. This was called the doctrine of transubstantiation.

This doctrine appeared to Luther, at the dawn of reformation, to be absurd; and he was of opinion, that the sacrament consisted of the substance of Christ's body and blood, together with the substance of the bread and wine; or, in other words, that the substance of the bread remained, but the body of Christ was inherent in it, so that the substance of the bread and of the body and blood of Christ was there also. This was called the doctrine of consubstantiation, in contradistinction to the former.

Calvin, again, considered the latter opinion as erroneous. He gave it out that the bread was not actually the body of Jesus Christ, nor the wine his blood, but that both his body and blood were sacramentally received by the faithful in the use of the bread and wine. Calvin, however, confessed himself unable to explain even this his own doctrine; for he says, "If it be asked me how it is, that is, how believers sacramentally receive Christ's body and blood, I shall not be ashamed to confess, that it is a secret too high for me to comprehend in my spirit, or explain in words."

But, independently of the difficulties, which have arisen from these different notions concerning the nature and constitution of the Lord's Supper, others have arisen concerning the time and the manner of the celebration of it.

The Christian Churches of the East, in the early times, justifying themselves by tradition and the custom of the Passover, maintained that the fourteenth day of the month Nissan ought to be observed as the day of the celebration of this feast, because the Jews were commanded to kill the Paschal lamb on that day. The Western, on the other hand, maintained, upon the authority of tradition and the primitive practice, that it ought to be kept on no other day than that of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Disputes again, of a different complexion, agitated the Christian world upon the same subject. One church contended that leavened, another that unleavened bread only should be used on this occasion. Others contended whether the administration of this sacrament should be by the hands of the elergy only. Others, whether it should not be confined to the sick. Others, whether it should be given to the young and mature promiscuously. Others, whether it should be received hy the communicants standing, sitting, or kneeling, or as the Apostles received it. And others, whether it should be administered in the night-time as by our Saviour, or whether in the day, or whether only once, as at the Passover, or whether oftener in the year.

Another difficulty, but of a different nature, has occurred with respect to the Lord's Supper. This has arisen from the circumstance, that other ceremonies were enjoined by our Savior, in terms equally positive as this, but which most Christians notwithstanding have thought themselves at liberty to reject. Among these the washing of feet is particularly to be noticed. This custom was of an emblematic nature. It was enjoined at the same time as that of the Lord's Supper, and on the same occasion. But it was enjoined in a more forcible and striking manner. The Sandimanians, when they rose into a Society, considered the injunction for this ordinance to be so obligatory, that they dared not dispense with it; and therefore, when they determined to celebrate the supper, they determined that the washing of feet should be an ordinance of their church. Most other Christians, however, have dismissed the washing of feet from their religious observance. The reason given has principally been, that it was an eastern custom, and therefore local. To this the answer has been, That the Passover, from whence the Lord's Supper is taken, was an eastern custom also, but that it was much more local. Travellers of different nations had their feet washed for them in the East. But none except those of the circumcision were admitted to the Passover-supper. If therefore the injunction relative to the washing of feet be equally strong with that relative to the celebration of the supper, it has been presumed that both ought to have been retained; and, if one has been dispensed with on account of its locality, that both ought to have been discarded.

That the washing of feet was enjoined much more emphatically than the supper, we may collect from Barclay, whose observations upon it I shall transcribe on this occasion:

"But to give a further evidence," says he, "how these consequences have not any bottom from the practice of that ceremony, nor from the words following, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' let us consider another of the like nature, as it is at length expressed by John*: 'Jesus riseth from supper and laid aside his garments, and took a towel, and girded himself: after that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the Disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded; Peter said unto him, 'Thou shalt never wash my feet:' Jesus answered him, 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.' So after he had washed their feet, he said, 'Know ye, what I have done to you? If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet: for I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.' As to which let it be observed," continues Barclay, "that John related this passage to have been done at the same time with the other of breaking of bread; both being done the night of the Passover after Supper. If we regard the narration of this, and the circumstances attending it, it was done with far more solemnity, and prescribed far more punctually and particularly, than the former. It is said only, 'as he was eating he took bread,' so that this would seem to be but an occasional business: but here, 'he rose up, he laid by his garments, he girded himself, he poured out the water, he washed their feet, he wiped them with a towel.' He did this to all of them; which are circumstances, surely, far more observable than those noted in the other. The former was a practice common among the Jews, used by all masters of families, upon that occasion; but this, as to the manner, and person acting it, to-wit, for the master to rise up, and wash the feet of his servants and disciples, was more singular and observable. In the breaking of bread, and giving of wine, it is not pleaded by our adversaries, nor yet mentioned in the text, that he particularly put them into the hands of all; but breaking it, and blessing it, gave it the nearest, and so they from hand to hand. But here it is mentioned, that he washed not the feet of one or two, but of many. He saith not in the former, if they do not eat of that bread, and drink of that wine, that they shall be prejudiced by it; but here he says expressly to Peter, that 'if he wash him not, he hath no part with him;' which being spoken upon Peter's refusing to let him wash his feet, would seem to import

* John xiii. 3, &c.

no less than not the continuance only, but even the necessity of the ceremony. In the former he saith, as it were passingly, 'Do this in remembrance of me;' but here he sitteth down again, he desires them to consider what he hath done, tells them positively, 'that as he has done to them, so ought they to do to one another;' and yet again he redoubles that precept, by telling them, 'that he has given them an example, that they should do so likewise.' If we respect the nature of the thing, it hath as much in it as either baptism or the breaking of the bread, seeing it is an outward element of a cleansing nature, applied to the outward man, by the command and the example of Christ, to signify an inward purifying. I would willingly propose this seriously to men, that will be pleased to make use of that reason and understanding that God hath given them, and not be imposed upon, nor abused by the custom or tradition of others, whether this ceremony, if we respect either the time that it was appointed in, or the circumstances wherewith it was performed, or the command enjoining the use of it, hath not as much to recommend it for a standing ordinance of the Gospel, as either water-baptism, or bread and wine, or any other of that kind? I wonder, then, what reason the Papists can give, why they have not numbered it among their sacraments, except merely 'voluntas Ecclesiæ et traditio Patrum;' that is, the tradition of the Fathers and the will of the Church."

The reader will see by this time, that on subjects, which have given rise to such controversies as Baptism and the Lord's Supper have now been described to have done, people may be readily excused, if they should entertain their own opinions about them, though these may be different from those, which are generally received by the world. The difficulties indeed, which have occurred with respect to these ordinances, should make us tender of casting reproach upon others, who should differ from ourselves concerning them. For, when we consider that there is no one point, connected with these ordinances, about which there has not been some dispute; that those, who have engaged in these disputes, have been men of equal learning and piety; that all of them have pleaded primitive usage, in almost all cases, in behalf of their own opinions; and that these disputes are not even now, all of them, settled; who will take upon him to censure his brother, either for the omission or the observance of one or the other rite? And let the Quakers, among others, find indulgence from their countrymen for their opinions on these subjects. This indulgence they have a right to claim, from the consideration that they themselves never censure others of other denominations on account of their religion. With respect to those

who belong to the Society, as the rejection of these ceremonies is one of the fundamentals of Quakerism, it is expected that they should be consistent with what they are considered to profess. But with respect to others, they have no unpleasant feelings towards those, who observe them. If a man believes that Baptism is an essential rite of the Christian church, the Quakers would not judge him, if he were to go himself, or if he were to carry his children, to receive it. And if, at the communion table, he should find his devotion to be so spiritualized, that in the taking of the bread and wine he really and spiritually discerned the body and blood of Christ, and was sure that his own conduct would be influenced morally by it, they would not censure him for becoming an attendant at the altar. In short, the Quakers do not condemn those of a different persuasion for their attendances on these occasions. They only hope that, as they do not see these ordinances in the same light as others, they may escape censure if they refuse to admit them among themselves.

CHAPTER XV.

SECTION I.

Baptism—Two Baptisms—that of John and of Christ—That of John was by water, a Jewish ordinance, and used preparatory to religious conversion and worship—hence John used it as preparatory to conversion to Christianity—Jesus submitted to it to fulfill all righteousness—others as to a baptism to repentance—but it was not initiative into the Christian church, but belonged to the Old Testament—Nor was John under the Gospel, but under the Law.

I COME now to the argument, which the Quakers have to offer for the rejection of the use of Baptism, and of the sacrament of the Supper; and first for that of the use of the former rite.

Two baptisms are recorded in Scripture, the baptism of John, and the baptism of Christ.

The baptism of John was by water, and a Jewish ordinance. The washing of garments and of the body, which were called Baptisms by the Ellenistic Jews, were enjoined to the Jewish nations as modes of purification from legal pollutions, symbolical of that inward cleansing of heart, which was necessary to persons before they could hold sacred offices, or pay their religious homage in the temple, or become the true worshippers of God. The Jews therefore, in after times, when they made proselytes from the Heathen-nations, enjoined these

the same customs as they observed themselves. They generally circumcised, at least, the proselytes of the covenant, as a mark of their incorporation into the Jewish church, and they afterwards washed them with water, or baptised them; which was to be a sign to them of their having been cleansed from the filth of idolatry, and an emblem of their fitness, in case of a real cleansing, to receive the purer precepts of the Jewish religion, and to walk in newness of life.

Baptism therefore was a Jewish ordinance, used on religious occasions; and therefore John, when he endeavored by means of his preaching to prepare the Jews for the coming of the Mesiah, and their minds for the reception of his new religion, used it as a symbol of the purification of heart that was necessary for the dispensation, which was then at hand. He knew that his hearers would understand the meaning of the ceremony. He had reason also to believe that on account of the nature of his mission they would expect it. Hence the Sanhedrim, to whom the cognisance of these legal cleansings belonged, when they were informed of the baptism of John, never expressed any surprise at it, as a new, or unusual, or improper custom. They only found fault with him for the administration of it, when he denied himself to be either Elias or the Christ.

It was partly upon one of the principles, that have been mentioned, that Jesus received the baptism of John. He received it, as it is recorded, because, "thus it became him to fulfill all righteousness." By the fulfilling of righteousness is meant the fulfilling of the ordinances of the law, or the customs required by the Mosaic dispensation in particular cases. He had already undergone circumcision as a Jewish ordinance. And he now submitted to baptism. For as Aaron and his sons were baptized previously to their taking upon them the office of the Jewish priesthood, so Jesus was baptized by John, previously to his entering upon his own ministry, or becoming the high priest of the Christian dispensation.

But though Jesus Christ received the baptism of John, that he might fulfill all righteousness, others received it as the baptism of repentance from sins, that they might be able to enter the kingdom that was at hand. This baptism, however, was not initiative into the Christian church. For the Apostles rebaptized some, who had been baptized by John. Those, again, who received the baptism of John, did not profess faith in Christ. John, again, as well as his doctrines, belonged to the Old Testament. He was no minister under the new dispensation, but the last prophet under the law. Hence Jesus said, that "though none of the prophets were greater than John the Baptist, yet he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Neither did he ever hear the Gospel preached;

for Jesus did not begin his ministry till John had been put into prison, where he was beheaded by the orders of Herod. John, in short, was, with respect to Jesus, what Moses was with respect to Joshua. Moses, though he conducted to the promised land, and was permitted to see it from mount Nebo, yet never entered it, but gave place to Joshua, whose name, like that of Jesus, signifies a Savior. In the same manner, John conducted towards Jesus Christ. He saw him once with his own eyes; but he was never permitted, while alive, to enter into his new kingdom.

SECTION II.

Second baptism, or that of Christ—this the baptism of the Gospel—this distinct from the former in point of time—and in nature or essence—As that of John was outward, so this was to be inward and spiritual—it was to cleanse the heart—and was to be capable of making even the Gentiles the seed of Abraham—This distinction of watery and spiritual baptism pointed out by Jesus Christ—by St. Peter—and by St. Paul.

The second baptism recorded in the Scriptures is that of Christ. This may be called the baptism of the Gospel, in contradistinction to the former, which was that of the Law.

This baptism is totally distinct from the former. John himself said, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear. He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*."

From these words it appears that this baptism is distinct in point of time from the former; for it was to follow the baptism of John: and secondly, in nature and essence; for whereas that of John was by water, this was to be by the Spirit.

This latter distinction is insisted upon by John in other places. For when he was questioned by the Pharisees, "why he baptized if he was not that Christ, nor Elias, nor that prophet†," he thought it a sufficient excuse to say, "I baptize with water." That is, I baptize with water only. I use only an ancient Jewish custom. I do not intrude upon the office of Christ, who is coming after me, or pretend to his baptism of the Spirit. We find also, that no less than three times in eight verses, when he speaks of his own baptism, he takes care to add to it the word "water‡," to distinguish it from the baptism of Christ.

As the baptism of John cleansed the body from the filth of the flesh, so that of Christ was really to cleanse the soul from the filth of sin. Thus John, speaking of Jesus Christ in allusion to his bap-

* Matt. iii. 11. † John i. 25. ‡ John i. 25—34.

tism, says, "whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire*." By this he insinuates, that in the same manner as the farmer with the fan in his hand winnows the corn, and separates the light and bad grains from the heavy and the good, and in the same manner as the fire afterwards destroys the chaff,—so the baptism of Christ, for which he was preparing them, was of an inward and spiritual nature, and would effectually destroy the light and corrupt affections, and thoroughly cleanse the floor of the human heart.

This baptism too was to be so searching as to be able to penetrate the hardest heart, and to make even the Gentiles the real children of Abraham. "For think not†," says John, in allusion to the same baptism, "to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." As if he had said, I acknowledge that you Pharisees can, many of you, boast of relationship to Abraham, by a strict and scrupulous attention to shadowy and figurative ordinances; that many of you can boast of relationship to him by blood, and all of you by circumcision; but it does not follow therefore that you are the children of Abraham. Those only will be able to boast of being his seed, to whom the fan and the fire of Christ's baptism shall be applied. The baptism of him, who is to come after me, and whose kingdom is at hand, is of that spiritual and purifying nature, that it will produce effects very different from those of an observance of outward ordinances. It can so cleanse and purify the hearts of men, that if there are Gentiles in the most distant lands, ever so far removed from Abraham, and possessing hearts of the hardness of stones, it can make them the real children of Abraham in the sight of God.

This distinction between the watery baptism of John and the fiery and spiritual baptism of Christ was pointed out by Jesus himself; for he is reported to have appeared to his disciples after his resurrection, and to have commanded them, "that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which," says he, "ye have heard from me. For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence‡."

St. Luke also records a transaction which took place, in which Peter was concerned, and on which occasion he first discerned the baptism of Christ, as thus distinguished, in the words which have just been given: "And as I began to speak§," says he, "the Holy

* Matt. iii. 12. † Matt. iii. 9. ‡ Acts i. 4. § Acts xi. 15, 16.

Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John, indeed, baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized by the holy Spirit."

A similar distinction is made also by St. Paul; for when he found that certain disciples had been baptized only with the baptism of John†, he laid his hands upon them and baptized them again,—but this was evidently with the baptism of the Spirit. In his epistle also to the Corinthians we find the following expression: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body‡."

SECTION III.

The Question now is, which of these two baptisms is included in the great commission given by Jesus to his apostles, "of baptizing in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost"—Quakers deny it to be that of John, because contrary to the ideas of St. Peter and St. Paul—because the object of John's baptism had been completed—because it was a type under the law, and such types were to cease.

It appears then that there are two baptisms recorded in Scripture, the one the baptism of John, the other that of Christ; that these are distinct from one another, and that the one does not include the other, unless he, who baptizes with water, can baptize at the same time with the Holy Ghost. Now St. Paul speaks only of one* baptism as effectual; and St. Peter must mean the same, when he speaks of the baptism that saveth. The question therefore is, which of the two baptisms, that have been mentioned, is the one effectual or saving baptism; or which of these it is that Jesus Christ included in his great commission to the Apostles, when he commanded them to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost§."

The Quakers say, that the baptism included in this commission was not the baptism of John.

In the first place St. Peter says it was not in these words||, "which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water, whose antitype¶, Baptism, doth now also save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

---

* Acts xix. † 1 Corr. xii. 13. ‡ Ephes. iv. 5.

§ It is on this great command that Christians found the duty of water-baptism.

|| 1 Peter iii. 20, 21.

¶ Antitype is the proper translation, and not "the like figure whereunto."

The apostle states here concerning the baptism that is effectual and saving: first, that it is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, which is effected by water. He carefully puts those upon their guard to whom he writes, lest they should consider John's baptism, or that of water, to be the saving one to which he alludes; for having made a beautiful comparison between an outward salvation in an outward ark, by the outward water, with this inward salvation, by inward and spiritual water, in the inward ark of the testament, he is fearful that his reader should connect these images, and fancy that water had anything to do with this baptism. Hence he puts his caution in a parenthesis, thus guarding his meaning in an extraordinary manner.

He then shows what this baptism is, and calls it "the answer of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." In fact he states it to be the baptism of Christ, which is by the Spirit; for he maintains, that he only is truly baptized, whose conscience is made clear by the resurrection of Christ in his heart. But who can make the answer of such a conscience, unless the Holy Spirit shall have first purified the floor of the heart; unless the spiritual fan of Christ shall have first separated the wheat from the chaff; and unless his spiritual fire shall have consumed the latter?

St. Paul makes a similar declaration: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ*." But no man, the Quakers say, merely by being dipped under water, can put on Christ; that is, can put on his life, his nature, and disposition, his love, meekness, and temperance, and all those virtues, which should characterize a Christian.

To the same purport are those other words by the same apostle: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life†." And again, "buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the co-operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead‡." By these passages the apostle Paul testifies, that he alone is truly baptized, who first dies unto sin, and is raised up afterwards from sin unto righteousness; or who is raised up into life with Christ; or who so feels the inward resurrection and glory of Christ in his soul, that he walks in newness of life.

The Quakers show again, that the baptism of John could not have

---

* Gal. iii. 27. † Rom. vi. 3, 4. ‡ Coloss. ii. 12.

been included in the great commission, because the object of John's baptism had been completed even before the preaching of Jesus Christ.

The great object of John's baptism was to make Jesus known to the Jews. John himself declared this to be the object of it: "But that *he* should be made manifest unto Israel, *therefore* am I come baptizing with water*." This object he accomplished in two ways: First, by telling all whom he baptized, that Jesus was coming; and these were the Israel of that time; for he is reported to have baptized all Jerusalem, which was the metropolis, and all Judea, and all the country round about Jordan. Secondly, by pointing him out personally†. This he did to Andrew; so that Andrew left John and followed Jesus. Andrew again made him known to Simon, and these to Philip; and Philip to Nathaniel: so that, by means of John, an assurance was given that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ.

The Quakers believe, again, that the baptism of John was not included in the great commission, because it was a type under the Law; and all types and shadows under the Law were to cease under the Gospel-dispensation, or the law of Christ.

The salvation of the eight by water, and the baptism of John, were both types of the baptism of Christ. John was sent expressly before Jesus, baptizing the bodies of men with water, as a lively image, as he himself explains it, of the latter baptizing their souls with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The baptism of John, therefore, was both preparative and typical of that of Christ. And it is remarked by the Quakers, that no sooner was Jesus baptized by John, with water in the type, than he was, according to all the Evangelists, baptized by the Holy Ghost in the antitype‡. No sooner did he go up out of the water, than John saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. It was this baptism of Jesus in the antitype, which occasioned John to know him personally, and enabled him to discover him to others. The baptism of John, therefore, being a type or figure under the Law, was to give way when the antitype or substance became apparent. And that it was to give way in its due time, is evident from the confession of John himself. For on a question, which arose between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying, and on a report spread abroad, that Jesus had begun to baptize, John says, "He (Jesus) must increase, but I must decrease§." This confession of John accords with the following expressions of St. Paul‖: "The

---

* John i. 31. † John i. 40. ‡ Matt. iii. 16. Mark i. 10.
§ John iii. 30. ‖ Heb. ix. 8, 9, 10.

Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a figure for the time then present"—"which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation."

SECTION IV.

Quakers show that the baptism included in the great commission, which has now appeared not to be the baptism of John, is the baptism of Christ, from a critical examination of the words in that commission—Way in which the Quakers interpret these words—This interpretation confirmed by citations from St. Luke and St. Paul.

Having attempted to show, according to the method of the writers in the Society, that the baptism of John is not the baptism included in the great commission, I shall now produce those arguments, by which they maintain, that the baptism, which is included in it, is the baptism of Christ.

These arguments will be found chiefly in a critical examination of the words of that commission.

To enable the reader to judge of the propriety of their observations upon these words, I shall transcribe from St. Matthew the three verses that relate to this subject.

"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*."

The first observation which the Quakers make is upon the word "therefore." As all power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth, and as I can on that account, and as I will qualify you, go ye therefore; that is, having previously received from me the qualifications necessary for your task, go ye.

The next observation is, that the commission does not imply that the Apostles were to teach and to baptize, as two separate acts; but, as the words intimate, that they were to teach, baptizing.

The Quakers say, again, that the word "teach" is an improper translation of the original Greek. The Greek word should have been rendered, "make disciples or proselytes." In several of the editions of our own Bibles the word "teach" is explained in the

* Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20.

margin opposite to it, by "make disciples or Christians of all nations," or in the same manner as the Quakers explain it.

On the word "baptize" they observe, that, because its first meaning is to wash all over, and because baptism with Christians is always with water, people cannot easily separate the image of water from the word, when it is read or pronounced. But if this image is never to be separated from it, how will persons understand the words of St. Paul, "for by one spirit are we all baptized into one body?" or those words of Jesus, "can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, or be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" or, if this image is not to be separated from it, how will they understand the Evangelist, who represents Jesus Christ as about to baptize, or wash all over, with fire? To baptize, in short, signifies to dip under water, but in its more general meaning to purify. Fire and water have equally power in this respect, but on different objects. Water purifies surfaces. Fire purifies by actual and total separation, bringing those bodies into one mass which are homogeneous, or which have strong affinities to each other, and leaving the dross and incombustible parts by themselves.

The word "in" they also look upon as improperly translated, This word should have been rendered "into." If the word "in" were the right translation, the words "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," might be construed into a form of words to be used at the time of baptism. But we have no evidence that such a formula was ever used when any of the apostles baptized. Indeed the plain meaning of the word is "into," and therefore all such formula is groundless. "Jesus Christ did not," says Zuinglius*, "by these words institute a form of baptism which we should use, as divines have falsely taught."

On the word "name" the Quakers observe, that when it relates to the Lord, it frequently signifies in Scripture his life, or his power, or his Spirit. Thus, "in my name they shall cast out devils†;" and "by what power, or by what name, have ye done this‡?"

From the interpretation, which has now been given of the meaning of several of the words in the verses that have been quoted from St. Matthew, the sense of the commission, according to the Quakers, will stand thus: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. In virtue of the power which I have, I will give you power also. I will confer upon you the gift of the Holy Spirit. When you have received it, go into different and distant lands. Go to the Gentiles,

---

* Lib. de Bapt. p. 56 to ii. Oper.

† Mark xvi. 17. ‡ Acts iv. 7.

who live in ignorance, darkness, and idolatry, and make them proselytes to my new dispensation, so purifying their hearts, or burning the chaff of their corrupt affections, by the active fire of the Holy Ghost, which shall accompany your preaching, that they may be made partakers of the divine nature, and walk in newness of life. And lest this should appear to be too great a work for your faith, I, who have the power, promise to be with you, with this my Spirit in the work, till the end of the world."

The Quakers contend that this is the true interpretation of this commission, because it exactly coincides with the meaning of the same commission, as described by St. Luke and St. Mark, and of that also, which was given to St. Paul.

St. Luke states the commission given to the Apostles to have been, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem*." The meaning therefore of the commission, as stated by St. Luke, is precisely the same as that stated by St. Matthew, as we have just explained it. For, first, all nations are included in it. Secondly, purification of heart, or conversion from sin, is insisted upon to be the object of it. And thirdly, this object is to be effected, not by the baptism of water (for baptism is no where mentioned), but by preaching, in which is included the idea of the baptism of the Spirit.

St. Mark also states the commission to be the same in the following words: "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*." Here all nations, and the preaching of the Gospel are mentioned again. But baptism is now added. But the baptism, that was to go with this preaching, the Quakers contend to be the baptism of the Spirit. For, first, the baptism here mentioned is connected with salvation. But the baptism according to St. Peter, "which doth also now save us, is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," or the baptism of the Spirit. Secondly, the nature of the baptism here mentioned is explained by the verse that follows it. Thus, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. And these signs shall follow them that believe: They shall speak with new tongues." This therefore is the same baptism as that, which St, Paul conferred on some of his disciples, by the laying on of his hands: "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues,

---

* Luke xxiv. 47. † Mark xvi. 15.

and prophesied*." Thus, again, it is demonstrated to be the baptism of the Spirit.

The commission also, which has been handed down to us by St. Matthew, will be found, as it has been now explained, to coincide in its object with that, which was given to St. Paul, as we find by his confession to Agrippa. For he declared he was sent as a minister to the Gentiles†, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith in Christ." But what was this, the Quakers say, but to baptize them into the life and spirit of a new and divine nature, or with the baptism of Christ?

And as we have thus obtained a knowledge from St. Paul of what his own commission contained, so we have, from the same authority, a knowledge of what it did not contain; for he positively declares, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, that "Christ sent him not to baptize (evidently alluding to baptism by water), but to preach the Gospel." It is clear, therefore, that St. Paul did not understand his commission to refer to water; and who was better qualified to understand it than himself?

It is also stated by the Quakers, as another argument to the same point, that if the baptism in the commission had been that of water only, the Apostles could have easily administered it of themselves, or without any supernatural assistance; but in order that they might be enabled to execute that baptism, which the commission pointed to, they were desired to wait for divine help. Jesus Christ said, "I send the promise of my father upon you. But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high; for John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence*." Now the Quakers ask, If baptism by water had been the baptism contained in the great commission, why could not the Apostles have performed it of themselves? What should have hindered them more than John from going with people into the rivers and immersing them? Why were they first to receive themselves the baptism of the Spirit? But if it be allowed, on the other hand, that when they executed the great commission they were to perform the baptism of Christ, the case is altered. It became them then to wait for the divine help. For it required more than human power to give that baptism, which should change the disposition and affections of men, and should be able to bring them from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God. And

* Acts xix. 6. † Acts xxvi. 17, 18. ‡ Luke xxiv. 49.

here the Quakers observe, that the Apostles never attempted to execute the great commission till the time fixed upon by our Savior in these words, "But tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." This was the day of Pentecost.

After this "they preached," as St. Peter says, "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," and with such efficacy, that "the Holy Ghost fell upon many of them who heard their words."

SECTION V.

Objection to the foregoing arguments of the Quakers; namely, "If it be not the baptism of John that is included in the great commission, how came the Apostles to baptize with water?"—Practice and opinion of Peter considered—also of Paul—also of Jesus Christ—This practice, as explained by these opinions, considered by the Quakers to turn out in favor of their own doctrines on this subject.

I HAVE now stated the arguments by which the members of this Society have been induced to believe that the baptism by the Spirit, and not the baptism by water, was included by Jesus Christ in the great commission, which he gave to his apostles, when he requested them "to go into all nations, and to teach them, baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Against these arguments the following question has been usually started as an objection: "If it be not included in the great commission, how came the Apostles to baptize? or, would they have baptized, if baptism had not been considered by them as a Christian ordinance?

The Quakers, in answering this objection, have confined themselves to the consideration of the conduct of the apostles Peter and Paul. For though Philip is said to have baptized also, yet he left no writings behind him, like the former; nor are so many circumstances recorded of him, by which they may be enabled to judge of his character, or to know what his opinions ultimately were upon that subject.

The Quakers consider the Apostles as men of the like passions with ourselves. They find the ambition of James and John, the apostacy and dissimulation of Peter, the incredulity of Thomas, the dissension between Paul and Barnabas, and the jealousies which some of them entertained towards one another, recorded in Holy Writ. They believe them also to have been mostly men of limited information, and to have had their prejudices like other people. Hence it was not to be expected that they should come all at once into the knowledge of Christ's kingdom; that, educated in a reli-

gion of types and ceremonials, they should all at once abandon these; that, expecting a temporal Messiah, they should at once lay aside temporal views; and that they should come immediately into the full purity of the Gospel-practice.

With respect to the apostle Peter, he gave early signs of the dullness of his comprehension with respect to the nature of the character and kingdom of the Messiah*;—for, when Jesus had given forth but a single parable, Peter was obliged to ask him the meaning of it. This occasioned Jesus to say, "Are ye also yet without understanding?"

In a short time afterwards, when our Savior told him†, that he himself must go into Jerusalem and suffer many things, and be killed, and be raised again the third day, Peter took him and rebuked him; saying, "Be it far from thee, Lord! This shall not be unto thee."

At a subsequent time, namely, just after the transfiguration of Christ, he seems to have known so little about spiritual things, that he expressed a wish to raise three earthly tabernacles; one to Moses, one to Elias, and a third to Jesus, for the retention of signs and shadows as a Gospel-labor, at the very time when Jesus Christ was opening the dismission of all but one, namely, "the tabernacle of God, that is with men."

Nor did he seem at a more remote period to have gained more large or spiritual ideas. He did not even know that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was to be universal. He considered it as limited to the Jews; though the words in the great commission, which he and the other apostles had heard, ordered them to teach all nations. He was unwilling to go and preach to Cornelius on this very account, merely because he was a Roman centurion; or, in other words, a Gentile; so that a vision was necessary to remove his scruples in this particular. It was not till after this vision, and his conversation with Cornelius, that his mind began to be opened; and then he exclaimed, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

The mind of Peter began now to be opened, and to see things in a clearer light; when a new occurrence, that took place nearly at the same time, seems to have removed the film still more from his eyes: for, while he preached to Cornelius and the others present, he perceived that "the Holy Ghost fell upon all of them that heard his words, as on himself and the other apostles at the beginning."

---

* Matt. xv. 16. † Matt. xvi. 21, 22.

Then remembered Peter the words of the Lord, how that he said, "John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost:" that is, Peter finding that Cornelius and his friends had received, by means of his own powerful preaching, the Holy Ghost, perceived then for the first time, to his great surprise, that he had been executing the great commission of Jesus Christ; or that he had taught a Gentile, and baptized him with the Holy Spirit. Here it was that he first made the discrimination between the baptism of John and the baptism of Christ.

From this time, there is reason to think that his eyes became fully open; for in a few years afterwards, when we have an opportunity of viewing his conduct again, we find him an altered man, as to his knowledge of spiritual things. Being called upon, at the council at Jerusalem, to deliberate on the propriety of circumcision to Gentile converts, he maintains that God gives his Holy Spirit as well to the Gentiles as to the Jews. He maintains, again, that God purifies by Faith. And he delivers it as his opinion, that circumcision is to be looked upon as a yoke. And here it may be remarked, that circumcision and baptism uniformly went together, when proselytes of the covenant were made, or when any of the heathens were desirous of conforming to the whole of the Jewish law.

At a time, again, subsequent to this, or when he wrote his Epistles, which were to go to the strangers all over Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, he discovers himself to be the same full-grown man in spiritual things on the subject of baptism itself, in those remarkable words which have been quoted, "whose antitype, baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" so that the last opinion of Peter on the subject of water-baptism contradicted his practice when he was but in his noviciate in Christ's kingdom.

With respect to the apostle Paul, whose practice I am to consider next, it is said of him, as of St. Peter, that he baptized.

That Paul baptized is to be collected from his own writings. For it appears by his own account, that there had been divisions among the Corinthians. Of those, who had been converted to Christianity, some called themselves after the name of Cephas, others after the name of Apollos, others after the name of Paul; thus dividing themselves nominally into sects, according to the name of him, who had either baptized or converted them. St. Paul mentions these circumstances; by which it comes to light that he used water-baptism: and he regrets that the persons in question should have made such a bad use of this rite, as to call themselves after him who bap-

tized them, instead of calling themselves after Christ, and dwelling on him alone. "I thank God," says he, "that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I baptized in my own name. And I baptized also the house of Stephanas. Besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel*."

Now this confession of the apostle, which is usually brought against the members of this Society, they consider to be entirely in their favor, and indeed decisive of the point in question. For they collect from hence, that St. Paul never considered baptism by water as any Gospel-ordinance, or as any rite indispensably necessary, when men were admitted as members into the Christian Church. For, if he had considered it in this light, he would never have said, that Christ sent him not to baptize, but to preach his Gospel. Neither would he have thanked God, on account of the mere abuse of it, that he had baptized so few; for doubtless there were many among the learned Greeks, who abused his preaching, and who called it foolishness: but yet he no where says, that he was sorry on that account that he ever preached to them; for preaching was a Gospel-ordinance, enjoined him, by which many were to be converted to the Christian faith. Again, if he had considered water-baptism as a necessary mark of initiation into Christianity, he would have uniformly adopted it, as men became proselytes to his doctrines. But, among the thousands whom in all probability he baptized with the Holy Ghost among the Corinthians, it does not appear that there were more than the members of the three families of Crispus, Gaius, and Stephanas, whom he baptized with water.

But still it is contended, that Paul says of himself that he baptized. The Quakers agree to this; but they say that he must have done it in these instances, on motives very different from those of an indispensable Christian rite.

In endeavoring to account for these motives, the Quakers consider the apostle Paul, not as in the situation of Peter and others, who were a long time in acquiring their spiritual knowledge, during which they might be in doubt as to the propriety of many customs, but as coming, on the other hand, quickly and powerfully into the knowledge of Christ's kingdom. Hence, when he baptized, they impute no ignorance to him. They believe he rejected water-baptism as a Gospel-ordinance, but that he considered it in itself as a harmless ceremony; and that, viewing it in this light, he used it out of condescension to those Ellenistic Jews, whose prejudices, on ac-

* 1 Cor. i. 14, 15, 16.

count of the washings of Moses, and their customs relative to proselytes, were so strong, that they could not separate purification by water from conversion to a new religion. For St. Paul confesses himself, that "to the weak he became as weak, that he might gain the weak, and was made all things to all men, that he might by all means save some." Of this his condescension many instances are recorded in the New Testament,—though it may be only necessary to advert to one. At the great council of Jerusalem, where Paul, Barnabas, Peter, James, and others were present, it was determined that circumcision was not necessary to the Gentiles*. St. Paul, himself, with some others, carried the very letter of the council, containing their determination upon this subject, to Antioch, to the bretheren there. This letter was addressed to the brethren of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. After having left Antioch, he went to Derbe and Lystra; where, notwithstanding the determination of himself and the rest of the council, that circumcision was not a Christian rite, he† circumcised Timotheus, in condescension to the weakness of the Jews, who were in those quarters.

In addition to these observations on the practice and opinions of the Apostles, in the course of which the Quakers presume it will be found that the baptism of John is not an ordinance of the Gospel, they presume the same conclusion will be adopted, if they take into consideration the practice and opinions of Jesus Christ.

That Jesus Cnrist never forbade water-baptism, the Quakers readily allow. But they conceive his silence on this subject to have arisen from his knowledge of the internal state of the Jews: he knew how carnal their minds were, how much they were attached to outward ordinances, and how difficult it was all at once to bring them into his spiritual kingdom. Hence he permitted many things for a time, on account of the weakness of their spiritual vision.

That Jesus submitted also to baptism himself, they allow. But he submitted to it, not because he intended to make it an ordinance under the new dispensation, but, to use his own words, "that he might fulfill all righteousness." Hence also he was circumcised; hence he celebrated the Passover; and hence he was enabled to use these remarkable words upon the cross, "It is fulfilled."

But though Jesus Christ never forbade water-baptism, and though he was baptized with water by John, yet he never baptized any one himself. A rumor had gone abroad among the Pharisees, that Jesus had baptized more disciples than John the Baptist. But John, the beloved disciple of Jesus, who had leaned on his bosom, and who

---

* Acts xv. † Acts xvi. 3.

knew more of his sentiments and practice than any other person, is very careful in correcting this hear-say report, as if unworthy of the spiritual mind of his master, and states positively "that Jesus baptized not*."

The Quakers lay a great stress upon this circumstance: for they say, that if Jesus never baptized with water himself, it is a proof that he never intended to erect water-baptism into a gospel-rite. It is difficult to conceive, they say, that he should have established a sacrament, and that he should never have administered it. Would he not, on the other hand, if his own baptism had been that of water, have begun his ministry by baptizing his own disciples, notwithstanding they had previously been baptized by John? But he not only never baptized himself, but is no where recorded that he ordered his disciples to baptize with water†. He once ordered a leper to go to the priest and to offer the gift for his cleansing; at another time‡, he ordered a blind man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam; but he never ordered any one to go and be baptized with water. On the other hand, it is said by the Quakers, that he clearly intimated to three of his disciples at the transfiguration, that the dispensations of Moses and John were to pass away; and that he taught himself "that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" or that it consisted not in those outward and lifeless ordinances, in which many of those, to whom he addressed himself, placed the essence of their religion.

CHAPTER XVI.

Supper of the Lord—Two such suppers; one enjoined by Moses, the other by Jesus Christ—The former called the Passover—original manner of its celebration—the use of bread and wine added to it—these long in use when Jesus Christ celebrated it—Since his time alterations made in this supper by the Jews—but bread and wine still continued to be component parts of it, and continue so to the present day—Modern manner of the celebration of it.

There are two Suppers of the Lord recorded in the Scriptures; the first enjoined by Moses, and the second by Jesus Christ.

The first is called the Supper of the Lord, because it was the last supper which Jesus Christ participated with his disciples, or which the Lord and Master celebrated with them in commemoration of the Passover. And it may not improperly be called the Supper of the

---

* John iv. 2. † Matth. viii. 4. ‡ John ix. 7.

Lord on another account, because it was the supper which the lord and master of every Jewish family celebrated, on the same festival, in his own house.

This supper was distinguished, at the time alluded to, by the name of the Pass-over supper. The object of the institution of it was to commemorate the event of the Lord passing over the houses of the Israelites in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered the former from their hard and oppressive bondage.

The directions of Moses concerning this festival were short, but precise.

On the fourteenth day of the first month, called Nissan, the Jews were to kill a lamb in the evening. It was to be eaten in the same evening, roasted with fire; and the whole of it was to be eaten, or the remains of it to be consumed with fire before morning. They were to eat it with loins girded, with their shoes on their feet, and with their staves in their hands, and to eat it in haste. The bread, which they were to eat, was to be unleavened, all of it, and for seven days. There was to be no leaven in their houses during that time. Bitter herbs also were to be used at this feast. And none, who were uncircumcised, were allowed to partake of it.

This was the simple manner, in which the Passover and the feast of unleavened bread (which was included in it) were first celebrated. But as the Passover, in the age following its institution, was not to be killed and eaten in any other place than where the Lord chose to fix his name, which was afterwards at Jerusalem, it was suspended for a time. The Jews, however, retained the festival of unleavened bread wherever they dwelt. At this last feast, in process of time, they added the use of wine to the use of bread. The introduction of the wine was followed by the introduction of new customs. The lord or master of the feast used to break the bread, and to bless it, saying, "Blessed be thou, O Lord, who givest us the fruits of the earth!" He used to take the cup, which contained the wine, and bless it also: "Blessed be thou, O Lord, who givest us of the fruit of the vine!" The bread was twice blessed upon this occasion, and given once to every individual at the feast. But the cup was handed round three times to the guests. During the intervals between the blessing and taking of the bread and of the wine, the company acknowledged the deliverance of their ancestors from the Egyptian bondage; they lamented their present state; they confessed their sense of the justice of God in their punishment; and they expressed their hope of his mercy, from his former kind dealings and gracious promises.

In process of time, when the Jews were fixed at Jerusalem, they

revived the celebration of the Passover; and as the feast of unleavened bread was connected with it, they added the customs of the latter, and blended the eating of the lamb, and the use of the bread and wine, and their several accompaniments of consecration, into one ceremony. The bread therefore and the wine had been long in use as constituent parts of the Passover-supper, (and indeed of all the solemn feasts of the Jews) when Jesus Christ took upon himself, as the master of his own family of disciples, to celebrate it. When he celebrated it, he did as the master of every Jewish family did at that time. He took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave it to his disciples. He took the cup of wine, and gave it to them also. But he conducted himself differently from others in one respect; for he compared the bread of the Passover to his own body, and the wine to his own blood, and led the attention of his disciples from the old object of the Passover, or deliverance from Egyptian bondage, to a new one, or deliverance from sin.

Since the time of our Savior, we find that the Jews, who have been dispersed in various parts of the world, have made alterations in this supper; but all of them have concurred in retaining the bread and wine as component parts of it. This will be seen by describing the manner, in which it is celebrated at the present day.

On the fourteenth day of the month Nissan, the first-born son of every family fasts, because the first-born in Egypt were smitten on that night. A table is then set out, and covered with a cloth. On the middle of it is placed a large dish, which is covered with a napkin. A large Passover-cake of unleavened bread, distinguished by marks, and denominated "Israelite," is then laid upon this napkin. Another, with different marks, but denominated "Levite," is laid upon the first; and a third, differently marked, and denominated "Priest," is laid upon the second. Upon this again a large dish is placed; and in this dish is a shank-bone of a shoulder of lamb, with a small matter of meat on it, which is burnt quite brown on the fire. This is instead of the lamb roasted with fire. Near this is an egg, roasted hard in hot ashes that it may not be broken, to express the totality of the lamb. There is also placed on the table a small quantity of raw chervil, instead of the bitter herbs ordered; also a cup with salt water, in remembrance of the sea crossed over after that repast; also a stick of horse-radish with its green top to it, to represent the bitter labor that made the eyes of their ancestors water in slavery; and a couple of round balls, made of bitter almonds pounded with apples, to represent their labor in lime and bricks. The seat or couch of the master is prepared at the head of the table, and raised with pillows, to represent the masterly

authority, of which the Jews were deprived in bondage. The meanest of the servants are seated at the table, for two nights, with their masters, mistresses, and superiors, to denote that they were all equally slaves in Egypt, and that all ought to give the same ceremonial thanks for their redemption. Cups also are prepared for the wine, of which each person must drink four in the course of the ceremony. One cup extraordinary is set on the table for Elias, which is drunk by the youngest in his stead.

All things having been thus prepared, the guests wash their hands, and seat themselves at table. The master of the family, soon after this, takes his cup of wine in his right hand; and, the rest at the table doing the same, he says, together with all the others: "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine!" This is followed by a thanksgiving for the institution of the Passover. Then the cup of wine is drunk by all. Afterwards the master of the family says, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and commanded us to cleanse our hands!"

Then the master of the family desires the guests to partake of the chervil dipped in salt water, which he gives them with an appropriate blessing. He makes them touch also the dish containing the egg and shank-bone of the lamb, and to repeat with him a formula of words suited to the subject. He then takes the second cup of wine, and uses words, in conjunction with the rest, expressive of the great difference between this and any other night. After this, copious remarks follow on the institution of the Passover. Then follow queries and answers of the Rabbies on this subject. Then historical accounts of the Jews. Then the fifteen acts of the goodness of God to the Jewish nation, which they make out thus: He led the Jews out of Egypt. He punished the Egyptians. He executed judgment on their Gods. He slew their first-born. He gave the Jews wealth. He divided the sea for them. He made them pass through it as on dry land. He drowned the Egyptians in the same. He gave food to the Jews for forty years in the wilderness. He fed them with manna. He gave them the sabbath. He brought them to Mount Sinai. He gave them the Law. He brought them to the land of Promise. He built the Temple.

When these acts of the goodness of God, with additional remarks on the Passover out of Rabbi Gamaliel, have been recited, all the guests touch the dish, which contains the three cakes of bread before mentioned, and say, "This sort of unleavened bread, which we eat, is because there was not sufficient time for the dough of our ancestors to rise, until the blessed Lord, the king of kings, did reveal himself

to redeem them; as it is written, 'and they baked unleavened cakes of the dough, which they brought forth out of Egypt; for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared for themselves any victuals.'" After this they touch the horse-radish, and join in a narration on the subject of their bondage. Then they take their third cup of wine, and pronounce a formula of adoration and praise, accompanied with blessings and thanksgivings, in allusion to the historical part of the Passover. After this the master of the family washes his hands, and says, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and commanded us to cleanse our hands!" He then breaks the uppermost cake of bread in the dish, and says, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who hast brought forth bread from the earth!" Then he takes half of another cake of bread, and breaks it, and says, "Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, king of the universa, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and commanded us to eat the unleavened bread!" Then he gives every one at the table of each of the two cakes of bread that are broken, and every one repeats audibly the two last blessings. He then takes the green top from the horse-radish, and puts on the balls before mentioned, and pronounces a blessing. He then puts these into the hands of the guests, and they pronounce the same. After this he cuts the bottom cake, and puts a piece of it upon a piece of horse-radish, and pronouuces a formula of words in allusion to an historical fact.

These ceremonies having been thus completed, the guests sup.

After supper a long grace is said. Then the fourth cup is filled. A long prayer follows on the subject of creation. This is again followed by a hymn, enumerating and specifying the twelve wonders, which God did at midnight. Another hymn succeeds, specifying the fifteen great works, which God did at different times, both on the night and on the day of the Passover. Then follows a prayer in praise of God, in which a desire is expressed that they may be again brought to Jerusalem. Then follows a blessing on the fourth cup, which is taken; after which another hymn is sung, in which the assistance of the Almighty is invoked for the rebuilding of the temple. This hymn is followed by thirteen canticles, enumerating thirteen remarkable things belonging to the Jews; soon after which the ceremony ends.

This is the manner, or nearly the manner, in which the Passover is now celebrated by the Jews. The bread is still continued to be blessed, and broken, and divided, and the cup to be blessed, and

handed round among the guests; and this is done whether they live in Asia, or in Europe, or in any other part of the known world.

SECTION II.

Second Supper is that enjoined by Jesus at Capernaum—It consists of bread from Heaven—or of the flesh and blood of Christ—But these are not of a material nature, like the Pass-over-bread, or corporeal part of Jesus—but wholly of a spiritual—Those who receive it are spiritually nourished by it—and may be said to sup with Christ—This supper supported the Patriarchs—and must be taken by all Christians—Various ways in which this supper may be enjoyed.

The second supper recorded in the Scriptures, in which bread and the body and blood of Christ are mentioned. is that which was enjoined by Jesus when he addressed the multitude at Capernaum. Of this supper the following account may be given: "Labor not*," says he to the multitude, "for the meat, which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you."

A little further on in the same chapter, when the Jews required a sign from heaven (such as when Moses gave their ancestors manna in the wilderness) in order that they might believe on him, he addressed them thus: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he that cometh down from heaven, and giveth light unto the world.

"Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life. He that cometh unto me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst."

It appears that in the course of these and other words, that were spoken upon this occasion, the Jews took offence at Jesus Christ, because he said he was the bread that came down from heaven; for they knew he was the son of Joseph; and they knew both his father and mother. Jesus therefore directed to them the following observations:

"I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh

* John vi. 27.

to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will rise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

As the Jews were still unable to comprehend the meaning of his words, which they discovered by murmuring, and pronouncing them to be hard sayings, Jesus Christ closes his address to them in the following words: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life."

It appears from hence, according to the Quakers, that Jesus Christ, in mentioning the loaves, took occasion to spiritualize, as he did on all other fit occasions, and to direct the attention of his followers from natural to spiritual food, or from the food that perisheth to that which giveth eternal life.

Jesus Christ calls himself on this occasion the living bread. He says that this bread is his flesh, and that this flesh is meat indeed. The first conclusion which the Quakers deduce on this subject is, that this flesh and blood, or this bread, or this meat, which he recommends to his followers, and which he also declares to be himself, is not of a material nature. It is not, as he himself says, like the ordinary meat that perisheth, not like the outward manna, which the Jews ate in the wilderness for their bodily refreshment. It cannot therefore be common bread, nor such bread as the Jews ate at their Passover, nor any bread or meat ordered to be eaten on any public occasion.

Neither can this flesh or this bread be, as some have imagined, the material flesh or body of Jesus. For, first, this latter body was born of the Virgin Mary; whereas, the other is described as having come down from heaven. Secondly, because, when the Jews said, "How can this man give us his flesh?" Jesus replied, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing;" that is, Material flesh and blood, such as mine is, cannot profit any thing in the way of quickening, or cannot so profit as to give life eternal: this is only the work of the spirit. And he adds. "The words I have spoken to you, they are Spirit, and they are Life."

This bread then, or this body, is of a spiritual nature. It is of a

spiritual nature, because it not only giveth life, but preserveth from death. Manna, on the other hand, supported the Israelites only for a time, and they died. Common bread and flesh nourish the body for a time, and it dies and perishes; but it is said of those, who feed upon this food, that they shall never die.

This bread or body must be spiritual again, because the bodies of men, according to their present organization, cannot be kept forever alive. But their souls may. The souls of men can receive no nourishment from ordinary meat and drink, that they should be kept alive, but from that which is spiritual only. It must be spiritual again, because Jesus Christ describes it as having come down from heaven.

The last conclusion, which the Quakers draw from the words of our Savior on this occasion, is, that a spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ is such an essential of Christianity, that no person, who does not partake of them, can be considered to be a Christian; "for, except a man eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, he has no life in him."

The Quakers, therefore, believe that this address of Jesus Christ to his followers, near Capernaum, relates wholly to the necessity of the souls of men being fed and nourished by that food, which they are alone capable of receiving; namely, that, which is of a spiritual nature, and which comes from above. This food is the Spirit of God, or, in the language of the Society, it is Christ. It is that celestial Principle, which gives light and life to as many as receive it and believe in it. It is that spiritual Principle, which was in the beginning of the world, and which afterwards took flesh. And those who receive it, are spiritually nourished by it, and may be said to sup with Christ; for he himself says, "Behold I stand at the door and knock. If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me*."

This Supper, which Jesus Christ enjoins, is that heavenly manna, on which the Patriarchs feasted before his appearance in the flesh, and by which their inward man became nourished, so that some of them were said to have walked with God; for these, according to St. Paul, "did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ†."

This Supper is also "that daily bread," since his appearance in the flesh; or as the old Latin translation has it, it is that supersubstantial bread, which Christians are desired to pray for in the Lord's

---

*Rev. iii. 20. †1 Cor. x. 3, 4.

Prayer; that bread which, according to good commentators, is above all substance and above all created things: for this bread fills and satisfies. By extinguishing all carnal desires, it leaves neither hunger nor thirst after worldly things. It redeems from the pollutions of sin. It so quickens, as to raise from death to life; and it gives therefore to man a sort of new and divine nature, so that he can dwell in Christ and Christ in him.

This Supper, which consists of this manna, or bread, or of this flesh and blood, may be enjoyed by Christians in various ways. It may be enjoyed by them in pious meditations on the Divine Being, in which the soul of man may have communion with the Spirit of God, so that every meditation may afford it a salutary supper, or a celestial feast. It may be enjoyed by them when they wait upon God in silence, or retire into the light of the Lord, and receive those divine impressions, which quicken and spiritualize the internal man. It may be enjoyed by them in all their several acts of obedience and regard to the words and doctrines of our Savior. Thus may men every day, nay every hour, keep a communion at the Lord's table, or communicate, or sup, with Christ.

SECTION III.

The question then is, Whether Jesus Christ instituted any new Supper, distinct from that of the Passover, and in addition to that enjoined at Capernaum, to be observed as a ceremonial by Christians?—Quakers say that no such institution can be collected from the accounts of Matthew, or of Mark, or of John—the silence of the latter peculiarly impressive in the present case.

It appears then that there are two Suppers recorded in the Scriptures; the one enjoined by Moses, and the other by Jesus Christ.

The first of these was of a ceremonial nature, and was confined exclusively to the Jews; for to Gentile converts, who knew nothing of Moses, or whose ancestors were not concerned in the deliverance from Egytian bondage, it could have had no meaning.

The latter was of a spiritual nature. It was not limited to any nation. It had been enjoyed by many of the Patriarchs. Many of the Gentiles had enjoyed it also. But it was essentially necessary for all Christians.

Now the question is, Whether Jesus Christ, when he celebrated the Passover, instituted any new Supper distinct from that of the Passover, and in addition to that, which he had before enjoined at Capernaum, to be observed as an ordinance by the Christian world?

The Quakers are of the opinion that no institution of this kind

can be collected from Matthew, Mark, or John. St. Matthew* mentions the celebration of the Passover-supper in the following manner: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body.

"And he took the cup and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it.

"For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

St. Mark gives an account so similar to the former, that it is unnecessary to transcribe it. Both mention the administration of the cup; both, the breaking and giving of the bread: both, the allusion of Jesus to his own body and blood; both, the idea of his not drinking wine any more but in a new kingdom:—but neither of them mentions any command, nor even any insinuation, by Jesus Christ to his disciples, that they should do as he did at the Passover-supper.

St. John, who relates the circumstance of Jesus Christ washing the feet of his disciples on the Passover-night, mentions nothing even of the breaking of the bread, or of the drinking of the wine, upon that occasion.

As far therefore as the evangelists Matthew, Mark, and John are concerned, it is obvious, in the opinion of the Society, that Christians have not the least pretence either for the celebration of the Passover, or of that, which they usually call the Lord's Supper; for the command for such a Supper is usually grounded on the words "Do this in remembrance of me." But no such words occur in the accounts of any of the evangelists now cited.

This silence with respect to any command for any new institution is considered by the Society as a proof, as far as these evangelists are concerned, that none was ever intended. For, if the sacrament of the Supper was to be of such great and essential rite as Christians make it, they would have been deficient in their duty if they had failed to record it. St. Matthew, who was at the Supper, and St. Mark, who heard of what had passed there, both agree that Jesus used the ceremony of the bread and the wine, and also, that he made an allusion from thence to his own body and blood; but it is clear, the Quakers say, whatever they might have heard as spoken by him, they did not understand him as enjoining a new thing. But the si-

---

*Matth. xxvi. 26.

lence of John on this occasion they consider as the most impressive in the present case. For St. John was the disciple, who leaned upon the bosom of Jesus at this festival, and who of course must have heard all that he said. He was the disciple, again, whom Jesus loved, and who would have been anxious to have perpetuated all that he required to be done. He was the disciple, again, who so particularly related the spiritual supper which Jesus enjoined at Capernaum, and in this strong language: that "except a man eat his flesh and drink his blood, he has no life in him." Notwithstanding this, St. John does not even mention what took place on the Passover-night, believing, as the Quakers suppose, that it was not necessary to record the particulars of a Jewish ceremony, which, being a type, was to end when its antitype was realized, and which he considered to be unnecessary for those of the Christian name.

SECTION IV.

Account of St. Luke examined—according to him, Jesus celebrated only the old Jewish Passover—signified all future Passovers with him were to be spiritual—hence he turned the attention of those present from the type to the antitype—recommended his disciples to take their meals occasionally together in remembrance of their last supper with him; or if, as Jews, they could not get rid of the yoke of the Passover, to celebrate it with a new meaning.

St. Luke, who speaks of the transactions which took place at the Passover-supper, is the only one of the evangelists, who records the remarkable words, on which the ceremonial in question is grounded, "Do this in remembrance of me." St. Luke, however, was not himself at this supper. Whatever he has related concerning it was from the report of others.

But though the Quakers are aware of this circumstance, and that neither Matthew, Mark, nor John, gives an account of such words, yet they do not question the authority of St. Luke concerning them. They admit them, on the other hand, to have been spoken. They believe, however, on an examination of the whole of the narrative of St. Luke on this occasion, that no new institution of a religious nature was intended. They believe that Jesus Christ did nothing more than celebrate the old Passover; that he intimated to his disciples, at the time he celebrated it, that it was to cease; that he advised them, however, to take their meals occasionally, in a friendly manner, together, in remembrance of him; or if, as Jews, they could not all at once relinquish the Passover, he permitted them to celebrate it with a new meaning.

In the first place, St. Luke, and he is joined by all the other evangelists, calls the feast now spoken of "the Passover." Jesus Christ

also gives it the same name: for he says, "With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer."

Jesus Christ, according to St. Luke, took bread and brake it, and divided it among his disciples. He also took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it among them. But this, the Quakers say, is no more than what the master of every Jewish family did on the Passover-night. Nor is it any more, as will have already appeared, than what the Jews of London, or of Paris, or of Amsterdam, or of any other place, where bread and wine are to be had, do, on the same feast, at the present day.

But though Jesus Christ conducted himself so far, as other masters of families did, yet he departed from the formula of words that was generally used upon these occasions. For, in the first place, he is described to have said to his disciples, that "he would no more eat of the Passover, until it should be fulfilled in the kingdom of God;" and a little further on, that "he would not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God should come;" or, as St. Matthew has it, "till he should drink it new with them in his father's kingdom."

By these words the Quakers understand, that it was the intention of Jesus Christ to turn the attention of his disciples from the type to the antitype, or from the paschal lamb to the Lamb of God, which was soon to be offered for them. He declared that all his Passover suppers with them were in future to be spiritual. Such spiritual Passovers, the Quakers say, he afterwards ate with them on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit of God came upon them; when their minds were opened, and when they discovered, for the first time, the nature of his kingdom: and these spiritual Passovers he has since eaten, and continues to eat, with all those whose minds, detached from wordly pursuits and connections, are so purified and spiritualized as to be able to hold communion with God.

It is reported of him next, that "he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave to his disciples, saying, This is my body, which is given for you."

On these words the Quakers make the following observations: The word "this" does not belong to the word "bread;" that is, it does not mean, that this bread is my body. For the word "bread" in the original Greek is of the masculine, and the word "this" is of the neuter gender. But it alludes to the action of the breaking of the bread; from which the following new meaning will result: "This breaking of the bread, which you now see me perform, is a symbol or representation of the giving, or, as St. Paul has it, of the breaking of my body for you."

In the same manner they say that the giving of the wine in the

cup is to be understood as a symbol or representation of the giving of his blood for them.

The Quakers therefore are of opinion, when they consider the meaning of the sayings of Jesus Christ, both with respect to the bread and to the wine, that he endeavored again to turn the attention of his disciples from the type to the antitype, from the bread and wine to his own body and blood, from the paschal lamb, that had been slain and eaten, to the Lamb that was going to be sacrificed; and as the blood of the latter was, according to St. Matthew, for the remission of sins, to turn their attention from the ancient object of the celebration of the Passover, or salvation from Egyptian bondage, to a new object, or the salvation of themselves and others by this new sacrifice of himself.

It is reported of him again by St. Luke, after he had distributed the bread, and said, "This is my body which is given for you," that he added, "This do in remembrance of me."

These words the Quakers believe to have no reference to any new institution, but they contain a recommendation to his disciples to meet in a friendly manner and break their bread together in remembrance of their last supper with him; or if, as Jews, they could not all at once leave off the custom of the Passover, in which they had been born and educated, as a religious ceremony, to celebrate it, as he had then modified and spiritualized it, with a new meaning.

If they relate to the breaking of their bread together, then they do not relate to any Passover or sacramental eating, but only to that of their common meals; for all the Passovers of Jesus Christ with his disciples were in future, as we* have already shown, to be spiritual—and in this sense the primitive Christians seem to have understood the words in question; for in their religious zeal they sold all their goods, and, by means of the produce of their joint stock, kept a common table and lived together: but in the process of time, as this custom, from various causes, declined, they met at each other's houses, or at other appointed places, to break their bread together in memorial of the Passover-supper. This custom, it is remarkable, was denominated the custom "of breaking of bread;" nor could it have had any other name so proper, if the narration of St. Luke be true. For the words "do this in remembrance of me" relate solely, as he has placed them, to the breaking of the bread. They were used after the distribution of the bread, but were not repeated after the giving of the cup.

If they relate, on the other hand, to the celebration of the Pass-

---

* See quotations from Matthew and Luke.

over as it had been modified and spiritualized with a new meaning, then the interpetration of them will stand thus; "As some of you, my disciples, for ye are all Jews, may not be able to get over all your prejudices at once, but may celebrate the Passover again; and as it is the last time that I shall celebrate it with you as a ceremonial, I desire you to do it in remembrance or as a memorial of me. I wish the celebration of it always to bring to your recollection this our last public meeting, the love I bear to you, and my sufferings and my death. I wish your minds to be turned from carnal to spiritual benefits, and to be raised to more important themes than the mere escape of your ancestors from Egyptian bondage. If it has hitherto been the object of the Passover to preserve in your memories the bodily salvation of your ancestors, let it be used in future, if you cannot forsake it, as a memorial of your own spiritual salvation; for my body, of which the bread is a representation, is to be broken; and my blood, of which the wine is an emblem, is to be shed for the remission of your sins."

But in whatever sense the words "do this in remembrance of me" are to be taken, the Quakers are of opinion, as far as St. Luke states the circumstances, that they related solely to the disciples themselves. Jesus Christ recommends it to those, who were present, and to those only, to do this in remembrance of him; but he no where tells them to order or cause it to be done by the whole Christian world, as he told them to preach the Gospel to every creature.

To sum up the whole of what has been said in this chapter: If we consult St. Luke, and St. Luke only, all that we can collect on this subject will be, That the future Passover-suppers of Christ with his disciples were to be spiritual; that his disciples were desired to break their bread together in remembrance of him; or if, as Jews, they could not relinquish the Passover, to celebrate it with a new meaning; but that this permission extended to those only, who were present on that occasion.

SECTION V.

St. Paul's account—he states that the words "do this in remembrance of me" were used at the Passover-supper—that they contained a permission for a custom, in which both the bread and the wine were included—that this custom was the Passover, spiritualized by Jesus Christ—but that it was to last only for a time—some conjecture this time to be the destruction of Jerusalem—but the Quakers, till the Disciples had attained such a spiritual growth, that they felt Christ's kingdom substantially in their hearts—and as it was thus limited to them, so it was limited to such Jewish converts, as might have adopted it in those times.

The last of the sacred writers, who mention the celebration of the Passover-supper, is St. Paul, whose account is now to be examined.

St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians*, reproves them for some irregularities committed by them in the course of their religious meetings. What these meetings were is uncertain. They might have been for the celebration of the Passover-supper; for there was a synagogue of Jews at Corinth, of whom some had been converted. Or they might have been for the celebration of the Passover as spiritualized by Jesus Christ, or for the breaking of bread; which customs both the Jewish and Gentile converts might have adopted. The custom, however, at which these irregularities took place, is called by St. Paul the Lord's Supper. And this title was not inapplicable to it in either of the cases supposed, because it must have been, in either of them, in commemoration of the last supper, which Jesus Christ, or the Lord and Master, ate with his disciples before he suffered.

But, whichever ceremonial it was that St. Paul alluded to, the circumstances of the irregularities of the Corinthians obliged him to advert to, and explain, what was said and done by Jesus on the night of the Passover supper. This explanation of the apostle has thrown new light upon the subject, and has induced the Quakers to believe that no new institution was intended to take place as a ceremonial to be observed by the Christian world.

St. Paul, in his account of what occurred at the original Passover, reports that Jesus Christ made use of the words "this do in remembrance of me." By this the Quakers understand, that he permitted something to be done by those, who were present at this supper.

He reports also that Jesus Christ used these words not only after the breaking of the bread, but after the giving of the cup; from whence they conclude, that St. Paul considered both the bread and the wine as belonging to that, which had been permitted.

---

* Chap. xi.

St. Paul also says, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." By these words they believe they discover two things; first, the nature of the thing permitted; and secondly, that the thing permitted, whatever it was, was to last but for a time.

The thing, then, which was permitted to those, who were present at the Passover-supper, was to show or declare his death. The words "show or declare" prove, in the first place, the connection of the thing permitted with the Jewish Passover; for, after certain ceremonies had been performed on the Passover-night, "the showing forth or declaration," as it was called, followed, or the object of the meeting was declared aloud to the persons present; or it was declared to them publicly, in what particulars the Passover-feast differed from all the other feasts of the Jews. Secondly, the word "death" proves the thing permitted to have been the Passover, as spiritualized by Jesus Christ; for, by the new modification of it, his disciples, if they were unable to overcome their prejudices, were to turn their attention from the type to the antitype, or from the sacrifice of the paschal lamb to the sacrifice of himself, or to his own sufferings and death. In short, Jesus Christ always attempted to reform by spiritualizing. When the Jews followed him for the loaves, and mentioned manna, he tried to turn their attention from material to spiritual bread. When he sat upon Jacob's well, and discoursed with the woman of Samaria, he directed her attention from ordinary or elementary to spiritual and living water. So he did upon this occasion. He gave life to the dead letter of an old ceremony by a new meaning. His disciples were from henceforth to turn their attention, if they chose to celebrate the Passover, from the paschal lamb to himself, and from the deliverance of their ancestors out of Egyptian bondage, to the deliverance of themselves and others, by the giving up of his own body, and the shedding of his own blood, for the remission of sins.

And as the thing permitted was the Passover spiritualized in this manner, so it was only permitted for a time, or "until he come."

By the words "until he come" it is usually understood until Christ come. But though Christians have agreed upon this, they have disagreed upon the length of time, which the words may mean. Some have understood that Jesus Christ intended this spiritualized Passover to continue for ever, as an ordinance of the Church, for that "till he come" must refer to his coming to judge the world. But it has been replied to these, that in this case no limitation had been necessary; or it would have been said at once, that it was to be

a perpetual ordinance, or expressed in plainer terms than in the words in question.

Others have understood the words to mean the end of the typical world, which happened on the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jews were dispersed, and their Church, as a national one, done away. For the coming of Christ and the end of the world have been considered as taking place at the same time. Thus, the early Christians believed that Jesus Christ, even after his death and resurrection, would come again, even in their own lifetime, and that the end of the world would then be. These events they coupled in their minds*; "for they asked him privately, saying, Tell us when these things shall be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world." Jesus told them in reply, that the end of the world and his coming would be, when there were wars, and rumors of wars, and earthquakes, and famine, and pestilence, and tribulations on the earth; and that these calamities would happen even before the generation, then alive, would pass away. Now all these things actually happened in the same generation; for they happened at the destruction of Jerusalem. Jesus Christ therefore meant by the end of the world the end of the Jewish world, or of the world of types, figures, and ordinances: and he coupled naturally his own coming with this event; because he could not come fully into the hearts of any, till these externals were done away. He alluded, in short, to the end of the Jewish dispensation, and the beginning of his spiritual kingdom, or to the end of the ceremonial and the beginning of the Gospel-world.

Those, therefore, who interpret the words "till he come" to mean the end of the typical world, are of the opinion that the Passover, as spiritualized by Jesus Christ, was allowed to the disciples while they lived among a people so wedded to religious ceremonies as the Jews, with whom it would have been a stumbling-block in the way of their conversion if they had seen the apostles, who were their countrymen, rejecting it all at once; but that it was permitted them till the destruction of Jerusalem: after which event the Jews being annihilated as a nation, and being dispersed and mixed among the infinitely greater body of the Gentiles, the custom was to be laid aside, as the disuse of it could not be then prejudicial to the propagation of the Gospel among the community at large.

The Quakers, however, understand the words "till he come" to mean simply the coming of Christ substantially in the heart. Giving the words this meaning, they limit the duration of this spiritu-

---

Matt. xxiv.

alized Passover, but do not specify the time. It might have ceased, they say, with some of those present on the day of Pentecost, when they began to discover the nature of Christ's kingdom; and they think it probable, that it ceased with all of them when they found this kingdom realized in their hearts. For it is remarkable that those, who became Gospel-writers (and it is to be presumed that they had attained great spiritual growth when they wrote their respective works) give no instruction to others, whether Jews or Gentiles, to observe the ceremonial permitted to the disciples by Jesus, as any ordinance of the Christian Church. And in the same manner as the Quakers conceive the duration of the spiritualized Passover to have been limited to the disciples, they conceive it to have been limited to all other Jewish converts, who might have adopted it in those times; that is, till they should find, by the substantial enjoyment of Christ in their hearts, that ceremonial ordinances belonged to the old, but that they were not constituent parts of the new kingdom.

SECTION VI.

Quakers believe, from the preceding evidence, that Jesus Christ intended no ceremonial for the Christian Church—for, if the custom enjoined was the Passover spiritualized, it was more suitable for Jews than Gentiles—If intended as a ceremonial, it would have been commanded by Jesus to others besides the disciples, and by these to the Christian world—and its duration would not have been limited—Quakers believe St. Paul thought it no Christian ordinance—three reasons taken from his own writings.

The Quakers, then, on an examination of the preceding evidence, are of opinion that Jesus Christ, at the Passover-supper, never intended to institute a new supper distinct from that of the Passover, or in addition to that enjoined at Capernaum, to be observed as a ceremonial by Christians.

For, in the first place, St, Matthew, who was at the supper, makes mention of the words "Do this in remembrance of me."

Neither are these words, nor any of a similar import, recorded by St. Mark. It is true, indeed, that St. Mark was not at this supper. But it is clear he never understood from those who were, either that they were spoken, or that they bore this meaning, or he would have inserted them in his Gospel.

Nor is any mention made of such words by St. John. This was the beloved disciple, who was more intimate with Jesus, and who knew more of the mind of his master, than any of the others. This was he, who leaned upon his bosom at the Passover-supper, and who must have been so near him as to have heard all that passed

there; and yet this disciple did not think it worth his while, except manuscripts have been mutilated, to mention even the bread and the wine that were used upon this occasion.

Neither does St. Luke, who mentions the words "Do this in remembrance of me," establish any thing, in the opinion of the Quakers, material on this point. For it appears from him, that Jesus, to make the most of his words, only spiritualized the old Passover for his disciples, all of whom were Jews, but that he gave no command with respect to the observance of it by others. Neither did St. Luke himself enjoin or call upon others to observe it.

St. Paul speaks nearly the same language as St. Luke, but with this difference, that the supper, as thus spiritualized by Jesus, was to last but for a time*.

Now the Quakers are of opinion, that they have not sufficient ground to believe, from these authorities, that Jesus intended to establish any ceremonial as an universal ordinance for the Christian Church. For, if the custom enjoined was the spiritualized Passover, it was better calculated for Jews than for Gentiles, who were neither interested in the motives nor acquainted with the customs of that feast. But it is of little importance, they contend, whether it was the spiritualized Passover or not; for, if Jesus Christ had intended it, whatever it was, as an essential of his new religion, he would have commanded his disciples to enjoin it as a Christian duty, and the disciples themselves would have handed it down to their several converts in this light. But no injunction to this effect, either of Jesus to others, or of themselves to others, is to be found in any of their writings. Add to this, that the limitation of its duration for a time seems a sufficient argument against it as a Christian ordinance, because whatever is once, must be for ever, an essential in the Christian Church.

The Quakers believe, as a further argument in their favor, that there is reason to presume that St. Paul never looked upon the spiritual Passover, as any permanent and essential rite, which Christians were enjoined to follow. For nothing can be more clear, than that, when speaking of the guilt and hazard of judging one another by meats and drinks, he states it as a general and fundamental doctrine

*The extraordinary silence of St. John on this subject, as before mentioned, is considered by some as confirming the idea, that this Evangelist himself believed that the Passover, as spiritualized by Jesus Christ, was to cease with the Jewish constitution, or after the destruction of Jerusalem. For St. John did not write his Gospel till after this great event. But if he thought the ceremonial was then to cease, he would have had less reason for mentioning it, than any of those, who wrote prior to this epoch.

of Christianity, that the "kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*."

It seems also by the mode of reasoning, which the apostle adopts in his Epistle to the Corinthians on this subject, that he had no other idea of the observance of this rite, than he had of the observance of particular days; namely, that if men thought they were bound in conscience to keep them, they ought to keep them religiously. "He that regardeth a day," says the apostle, "regardeth it to the Lord:" that is, "He that esteemed a day," says Barclay, "and placed conscience in keeping it, was to regard it to the Lord (and so it was to him, in so far as he regarded it to the Lord, the Lord's day): he was to do it worthily; and if he were to do it unworthily, he would be guilty of the Lord's day, and so keep it to his own condemnation." Just in the same manner, St. Paul tells the Corinthian Jews, that if they observed the ceremonial of the Passover, or rather, "as often as they observed it," they were to observe it worthily, and make it a religious act. They were not then come together to make merry on the anniversary of the deliverance of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage, but to meet in memorial of Christ's sufferings and death. And therefore, if they ate and drank the Passover under its new and high allusions, unworthily, they profaned the ceremony, and were guilty of the body and blood of Christ.

It appears also from the Syriac and other oriental versions of the New Testament, such as the Arabic and Ethiopic, as if he only permitted the celebration of the spiritualized Passover for a time, in condescension to the weakness of some of his converts, who were probably from the Jewish synagogue at Corinth. For in the seventeenth verse of the eleventh chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians, the Syriac runs thus: "As to that, concerning which I am now instructing you, I commend you not, because you have not gone forward, but you have gone down into matters of less importance†." "It appears from hence," says Barclay, "that the apostle was grieved that such was their condition, that he was forced to give them instruction concerning those outward things, and doting upon which they showed that they were not gone forward in the life of Christianity, but rather sticking in the beggarly elements. And therefore the twentieth verse of the same version has it thus: "When then ye

---

* Romans xiv. 17

† The Syriac is a very ancient version, and as respectable, or of as high authority, as any. Leusden and Schaaf translate the Syriac thus: "Hoc autem, quod præcipio, non tanquam laudo vos, quia non progressi estis, sed ad id, quod minus est, descendistis." Compare this with the English edition.

meet together, ye do not do it, as it is just ye should in the day of the Lord; ye eat and drink*." Therefore showing to them, that to meet together to eat and drink outward bread and wine was not the labor and work of that day of the Lord.

Upon the whole, in whatever light the Quakers view the subject before us, they cannot persuade themselves that Jesus Christ intended to establish any new ceremonial distinct from the Passover-supper, and in addition to that, which he had before commanded at Capernaum. The only supper which he ever enjoined to Christians was the latter. This spiritual supper was to be eternal and universal. For he was always to be present with those "who would let him in, and they were to sup with him, and he with them." It was also to be obligatory, or an essential with all Christians. "For, except a man were to eat his flesh and drink his blood, he was to have no life in him." The supper, on the other hand, which our Savior is supposed to have instituted on the celebration of the Passover, was not enjoined by him to any but the disciples present. And it was, according to the confession of St. Paul, to last only for a time. This time is universally agreed upon to be that of the coming of Christ. That is, the duration of the spiritualized Passover was to be only till those, to whom it had been recommended, had arrived at a state of religious manhood, or till they could enjoy a supper, which Jesus Christ had commanded at Capernaum: after which repast, the Quakers believe, they would consider all others as empty, and as not having the proper life and nourishment in them, and as of a kind not to harmonize with the spiritual nature of the Christian religion.

---

* Quum igitur congregamini, non sicut justum est die Domini nostri; comeditis et bibitis—Leusden et Schaaf Lugduni Batavorum.

GREAT TENETS OF THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

Civil Government—First tenet is, that governors have no right to interfere with the governed on the subject of religion—and that if they interfere and insist upon things which the conscience disapproves, the governed ought to refuse a compliance with them, and to bear patiently all the penalties annexed to such a refusal—but never to resist the governors by violence, on this or any other accounts.

THE Quakers hold four principles, which I shall distinguish by the name of Great Tenets*. These are considered as arising out of the implied or positive injunctions of Christianity, and were insisted upon as essentials on the formation of the Society. The first of these is on the subject of Civil Government.

Civil Government had existed long before the appearance of Christianity in the world. Legislators since that æra, as they have imbibed its spirit, so they have introduced this spirit, more or less, into their respective codes. But no nation has ever professed to change its system of jurisprudence, or to model it anew, in consequence of the new light, which Christianity has afforded. Neither have the alterations been so numerous in any nation, however high its profession of Christianity, with respect to laws, as to enable us to say that there is any government in the known world, of Christian origin, or any government wholly upon the principles of the Gospel.

If all men were to become real Christians, Civil Government would become less necessary. As there would be then no offenses, there would be no need of magistracy or of punishment. As men would then settle any differences between them amicably, there would be no necessity for courts of law. As they would then never fight, there would be no need of armies. As they would then consider their fellow-creatures as brethren, they would relieve them as such, and there would be no occasion of laws for the poor. As men

* I call them Great Tenets, not because the Society calls them so, or thinks them more important than its fundamental principles, but because the world, judging by the conduct of the Quakers, considers them as the great component parts of their religion.

would then have more solicitude for the public good, and more large and liberal notions than at any former time, they would of themselves conceive and raise all necessary public institutions and works. Government, then, is not so necessary for real Christians. It is necessary principally, as the apostle says, for evil doers. But if it be chiefly necessary for evil doers, then governments ought to be careful how they make laws, which may vex, harass, and embarrass Christians, whom they will always find to be the best part of their communities; or, in other words, how they make laws, which Christians, on account of their religious scruples, cannot conscientiously obey.

It is a tenet of the members of this Society, on the subject of Government, that the civil magistrate has no right to interfere in religious matters, so as either to force any particular doctrines upon men, or to hinder them from worshipping God in their own way, provided that, by their creeds and worship, they do no detriment to others. They believe, however, that Christian churches may admonish such members as fall into error, and may even cut them off from membership; but this must be done, not by the temporal but by the spiritual sword.

This tenet they support, first by reason. Religion, they say, is a matter solely between God and man; that is, between God and that man who worships him. This must be obvious, they conceive, because man is not accountable to man for his religious opinions, unless he binds himself to the discipline of any religious Society, but to God alone. It must be obvious again, they say, because no man can be a judge over the conscience of another. He can know nothing of the sincerity or hypocrisy of his heart. He can be neither an infallible judge nor an infallible corrector of his religious errors. "The conscience of man," says Barclay, "is the seat and throne of God in him, of which He alone is the proper and infallible judge, who by his power and Spirit can rectify its mistakes." It must be obvious again, they say, from the consideration that, if it were even possible for one man to discern the conscience of another, it is impossible for him to bend or to control it. But conscience is placed both out of his sight and out of his reach. It is neither visible nor tangible. It is inaccessible by stripes or torments. Thus, while the body is in bondage on account of the religion of the soul, the soul itself is free; and, while it suffers under torture, it enjoys the Divinity, and feels felicity in his presence. But if all these things are so, it cannot be within the province either of individual magistrates or of governments consisting of fallible men, to fetter the consciences of those, who may live under them. And any attempt to this end is

considered by the Quakers as a direct usurpation of the prerogative of God.

This tenet they adopt, again, on a contemplation of the conduct and doctrines of Jesus Christ and of his Apostles. They find nothing in these, which can give the least handle to any man to use force in the religious concerns of another. During the life of Jesus Christ upon earth, it is no where recorded of him, that he censured any man for his religion. It is true that he reproved the Scribes and Pharisees; but this was on account of their hypocrisy, because they pretended to be what they were not. But he no where condemned the devout Jew, who was sincere in his faith. But if he be found no where to have censured another for a difference in religious opinion, much less was it ever said of him, that he forced him to the adoption of his own. In the memorable instance, in which James and John were willing to call fire from heaven to burn those, who refused to receive him, he rebuked them by an assurance, that "they knew not what Spirit they were of." And with respect to his doctrine, nothing can be more full to the point than his saying, that "his kingdom was not of this world;" by which he meant, that his dominion was wholly of a spiritual nature, and that men must cast off all worldly imaginations, and become spiritually-minded, before they could belong to him. But no application of outward force, in the opinion of this Society, can thus alter the internal man. Nor can even the creeds and doctrines of others produce this effect, except they become sanctioned by the divine influence on the heart.

Neither is it recorded of any of the Apostles, that they used any other weapons than those of persuasion and the power of God in the propagation of their doctrines, leaving such as did not choose to follow them to their own way. They were explicit also in stating the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, from whence an inference similar to the former is deducible; namely, that no compulsory interference can be effectual in matters of religion. And St. Paul in particular tells the Corinthians, that, in his spiritual services to them, he does not consider himself "as having any dominion over their faith, but as a helper of their joy*."

But if neither Jesus Christ, who was the author of that religion which many Civil Governments have established, nor the Apostles, who afterwards propagated it, forced their doctrines upon other men, or hindered them by force from worshipping in their own manner, even though the former could have called legions of angels to his support,—it certainly does not become weak, ignorant, and fallible

* 2 Cor. i. 24.

men, because they are placed in the situation of governors, to set up their own creeds as supreme, and to throw penalties and restrictions in the way of the religious exercise of others.

But if governors, contrary to the example of Jesus Christ and of his Apostles, should interfere in religious matters, and impose laws upon the governed, of which as Christians they cannot but disapprove,—then the Quakers are of opinion that the governed ought always to obey the laws of Jesus Christ, rather than the laws of any governors, who are only men. Thus, when Peter and John were commanded by the rulers of the Jews to speak no more in the name of Jesus, they dared not yield obedience to their commands, reasoning thus: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye*."

And as the governed, in such case, ought, in obedience to God, the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, and the King of kings, to refuse a compliance with the laws of their own governors, so they ought to be prepared patiently to submit to the penalties, which are annexed to such a refusal; and on no account (if just representations made in the meek and quiet spirit of their religion are not likely to be effectual) to take up arms, or resist them by force. And this doctrine they ground, first, on the principle, that it is not only more noble, but more consistent with their duty as Christians, to suffer, than to give growth to the passion of revenge, or by open resistance to become the occasion of loss of life to others; and, secondly, on the example of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles and primitive Christians, all of whom patiently submitted to the pains and penalties, inflicted upon them by the Governments of their respective times, for the exercise of their religion.

CHAPTER II.

Oaths—Quakers conceive it unlawful for Christians to take an oath—their sufferings on this account—consider oaths as unnecessary—as having an immoral tendency, which even the Heathens allowed—and as having been forbidden by Jesus Christ—explanation of the scriptural passages cited on this occasion—Christianity not so perfect with the lawfulness of oaths, as without it—other reasons taken from considerations relative to the ancient oath by the name of God.

A SECOND tenet, which the members of this Society hold, is, that it is unlawful for Christians to take a Civil Oath.

* Acts iv. 19.

Many and grievous were the sufferings of these people, in the history, on account of their refusing to swear before the civil magistrate. They were insulted, fined, and imprisoned. Some of the judges, too, indulged a rancor against them on this account unworthy of their high office, which prescribed justice impartially to all. For, when they could not convict them of the offences laid to their charge, they administered to them the Oath of Allegiance, knowing that they would not take it, and that confiscation of property and imprisonment would ensue. But neither ill-usage, nor imprisonment, nor loss of property, ever made any impression upon them, so as to induce them to swear in judicial cases; and they continued to suffer, till the Legislature, wearied out with the cries of their oppression, decreed that their affirmation should in all cases, except criminal, or in that of serving upon juries, or in that of qualifications for posts of honor or emolument under Government, be received as equivalent to their oath. And this indulgence is continued to them by law to the present day.

The Quakers have an objection to oaths, as solemn appeals to God, because they are unnecessary.

It is an old saying among their writers, that "Truth was before all oaths." By this they mean, that there was a time when men's words were received as truths without the intervention of an oath. Ancient fable, indeed, tells us, that there were no oaths in the Golden Age, but that, when men departed from their primitive simplicity, and began to quarrel with one another, they had recourse to falsehood to substantiate their own case; after which it became necessary that some expedient should be devised, in the case of disputes, for ascertaining the Truth. Hence, Hesiod makes the God of Oaths the son of Eris or Contention. This account differs but little from that of Polybius, who says that the use of oaths in judgment was rare among the ancients, but that, as perfidy grew, oaths increased.

And as it is a saying of the Quakers, that "Truth was before all oaths," so they believe that "truth would be spoken, if oaths were done away." Thus, that which is called Honor by the world will bind men to the truth, who perhaps know but little of religion. But if so, then he, who makes Christianity his guide, will not be found knowingly in a falsehood, though he be deprived of the opportunity of swearing.

But if it be true, that truth existed before the invention of oaths, and that truth would still be spoken even if all oaths were abolished, —then the Quakers say that oaths are not so necessary as some have imagined, because they have but a secondary effect in the production of the truth. This conclusion they consider, also, as the result of rea-

son. For good men will speak truth without an oath, and bad men will hardly be influenced by one. And where oaths are regarded, it is probable that truth is forced out of men, not so much because they consider them as solemn appeals to God, as that they consider the penalties, which will follow their violation; so that a simple affirmation, under the same pains and penalties, would be equally productive of the truth.

They consider oaths, again, as very injurious to morality. For, first, they conceive it to be great presumption in men to summon God as a witness in their trifling and earthly concerns. They believe, secondly, that if men accustom themselves to call upon God on civil occasions, they render his name so familiar to them, that they are likely to lose the reverence due to it; or so to blend religious with secular considerations, that they become in danger of losing sight of the dignity, solemnity, and awfulness of devotion. And it is not an unusual remark, that persons the most accustomed to oaths are the most liable to perjury. A Custom-house oath has become proverbial in our own country. I do not mean by this to accuse mercantile men in particular, but to state it as a received opinion, that where men make solemn things familiar, there is a danger of their moral degradation. Hence, the Quakers consider the common administration of oaths to have a tendency, that is injurious to the moral interest of men.

This notion relative to the bad tendency of oaths the Quakers state to have prevailed even in the Gentile world. As Heathen philosophy became pure, it branded the system of swearing as pernicious to morals. It was the practice of the Persians to give each other their right hand, as a token of their speaking the truth. He, who gave his hand deceitfully, was accounted more detestable than if he had sworn. The Scythians, in their conference with Alexander the Great, addressed him thus: "Think not that the Scythians confirm their friendship by an oath. They swear by keeping their word." The Phrygians were wholly against oaths. They neither took them themselves, nor required them of others. Among the proverbs of the Arabs this was a celebrated one: "Never swear; but let thy word be Yes or No." So religious was Hercules, says Plutarch, that he never swore but once. Clinias, a Greek philosopher, and a scholar of Pythagoras, is said to have dreaded an oath so much, that, when by swearing he could have escaped a fine of three talents, he chose rather to pay the money than do it, though he was to have sworn nothing but the truth. Indeed, throughout all Greece, the system of swearing was considered as of the most immoral tendency; the very word, which signified "perjured" in

the Greek language, meaning, when analysed, "he that adds oath to oath," or, "the taker of many oaths."

But, above all, the Quakers consider oaths as unlawful for Christians, because they have been positively forbidden by Jesus Christ. The words, in which they conceive this prohibition to have been contained, they take from the Sermon on the Mount.

"Again, ye have heard, that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not foreswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

"But I say unto you, Swear not at all: neither by heaven; because it is God's throne:

"Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King.

"Neither shalt thou swear by the head; because thou canst not make one hair white or black.

"But let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil*."

It is said by those, who oppose the Society on this subject, that these words relate not to civil oaths, but to such as are used by profane persons in the course of their conversation. But the Quakers deny this; because the Disciples, as Jews, must have known that profane swearing had been unlawful long before this prohibition of Jesus Christ. They must relate, therefore, to something else; and to something, which had not before been forbidden.

They deny it also on account of the construction of the sentences, and of the meaning of the several words in these. For the words "Swear not at all," in the second of the verses which have been quoted, have an immediate reference to the words in the first. Thus they relate to the word "forswear" in the first. But if they relate to the word "forswear," they must relate to perjury; and if to perjury, then to a civil oath, or to an oath in which an appeal is made to God by man, as to something relating to himself. The word Oath also is explicitly mentioned in the first of these verses, and mentioned as an oath, which had been allowed. Now there is one oath which had been allowed in ancient time. The Jews had been permitted, in matters of judgment, to swear by the name of God. This permission was given them for one, among other reasons, that they might be prevented from swearing by the name of those idols, by which their neighbors swore; for a solemn appeal to any Heathen god necessarily includes an acknowledgment of the omnipresence of the same.

---

*Matt. v. 33—37.

That the words "Swear not at all" related to this oath in particular, they conceive to be obvious from the prohibition in the verses, which have been cited, of swearing by Heaven, by Earth, and by other things. The Jews, knowing the sacredness of the name of God, had an awful notion of the consequences of perjury, if committed after an appeal to it, and therefore had recourse to the names of the creatures, in case they should swear falsely. But even the oaths thus substituted by them are forbidden by Jesus Christ; and they are forbidden upon this principle, as we find by a subsequent explanation given by St. Matthew, that whosoever swore by these creatures, really and positively swore by the name of God. But if they are forbidden, because swearing by the creatures is the same thing as swearing by God who made them, then the oath by "the name of God," which had been permitted to the Jews of old, was intended by Jesus Christ to be discontinued, or to have no place in his new religion.

The Quakers, then, considering the words in question to have the meaning now annexed to them, give the following larger explanation of what was the intention of our Savior upon this occasion.

In his sermon on the Mount, of which these words on the subject of Oaths are a part, he inculcated into his Disciples a system of morality far exceeding that of the Jews; and therefore, in the verses which precede those upon this subject, he tells them, that whereas it was said of old, "Thou shalt not kill," he expected of them that they should not entertain a passion of revenge. And whereas it was said of old, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," he expected that they should not even lust after others, if they were married, or after those in a married state. Thus he brings both murder and adultery from act to thought. He attaches a criminality to unlawful feelings if not suppressed,—or aims at the subjugation of the passions, as the springs of the evil actions of men. Going on to show the further superiority of his system of morality over that of the Jews, he says, again, "Whereas it was said of old, Thou shalt not forswear thyself," he expects that they should not swear at all, not even by the name of God, which had been formerly allowed; for that he came to abrogate the ancient law, and perjury with it. It was his object to make the word of his true Disciples equal to the ancient oath. Thus he substituted truth for oaths. And he made this essential difference between a Jew and a Christian, That whereas the one swore in order that he might be believed, the other was to speak truth in order that he might not swear. Such was the intended advance from Jew to Christian, or from Moses to Christ.

The Quakers are further confirmed in their ideas upon this subject,

by believing that Christianity would not have been as perfect as they apprehend it to have been intended to be without this restriction upon oaths. Is it possible, they say, that Jesus Christ would have left it to Christians to imagine that their words were to be doubted on any occasion? Would he have left it to them to think so dishonorably of one another, or of their new vocation, that their words were to be tried by the touchstone of oaths, when his religion was to have a greater effect than any former system of morality ever known, in the production of truth? Is it possible, when oaths sprung out of fraud and falsehood, as he himself witnesses (for whatever is more than Yea and Nay cometh of evil) that he would have left this remnant of antiquity standing, as if his religion was not intended to extirpate the very ground-work of it?

Finally, they are confirmed in their ideas upon this subject, from a belief that oaths were to cease either at the coming of Jesus Christ, or as men became Christians. For, in the first place, the oath "by the name of God" is considered by some, as I have before noticed, to have been permitted to the Jews during their weak state, that they might not swear by the idols of their contemporary neighbors, and thus lose sight of the only and true God. But what Christian stands in need of any preservative against idolatry, or of any commemorative of the existence and superintendence of an almighty, wise, beneficent, and moral Governor of the World? Some, again, have imagined, that as the different purifications among the Jews, denoting the holiness of God, signified that it became men to endeavor to be holy,—so the oath by the name of God, denoting the verity of God, signified that it became men to devote themselves to the truth. But no true Christian stands in need of such symbols to make him consider his word as equivalent to his oath. Others, again, have imagined that the oath "by the name of God" typified the Truth, or the Eternal Word. But as the type ceases when the antitype appears,—so the coming of Jesus Christ, who in the Gospel-called language is both the Truth and the Eternal Word, may be considered as putting an end to this, as to other types and shadows of the Jewish church.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

War—Tenet on War—Quakers hold it unlawful for Christians to fight—scriptural passages which they produce in support of this tenet—arguments which others produce from scriptural authority against it—reply of the Quakers to these arguments.

THE next of the great tenets which the members of this Society hold is on the subject of War. They believe it unlawful for Christians to engage in the profession of arms, or indeed to bear arms, under any circumstance of hostility whatever. Hence there is no such character as that of a Quaker soldier. A Quaker is always able to avoid the regular army, because the circumstance of entering into it is generally a matter of choice. But where he has no such choice, as is the case in the militia, he either submits, if he has property, to distraint upon it; or, if he has not, to prison.

The Quakers ground the illicitness of war on several passages, which are to be found in the New Testament*. I shall not quote all the texts, which they bring forward, but shall make a selection of them on this occasion.

Jesus Christ, in the famous sermon which he preached upon the mount, took occasion to mention specifically some of the precepts of the Jewish law, and to inform his hearers that he expected of those who were to be his true disciples, that they would carry these to a much higher extent in their practice under the New Dispensation, which he was then affording them. Christianity required a greater perfection of the human character than was required under the Law: Men were not only not to kill, but not even to cherish the passion of revenge. And "Whereas it was said of old, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, I say unto you, says Christ, that ye resist not evil. But whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to

* The Quakers have been charged with inconsistency in refusing military service, and yet in paying those taxes, which are expressly for the support of wars. To this charge they reply, That they believe it to be their duty "to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's," and to leave the application of it to Cæsar himself as he judges best for the support of Government. This duty they collect from the example of Jesus Christ, who paid the tribute money himself, and ordered his Disciples to do it,—and this to a government not only professedly military, but distinguished for its idolatry and despotism. Personal service, however, they conceive to militate against a positive command by our Savior, which will be explained in this chapter.

him the other also*." And further on in the same chapter, he says, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor. and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies†, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you. For, if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do do not even the publicans the same? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Now the Quakers are of opinion, that no man can receive this doctrine in his heart, and assist either offensively or defensively in the operations of war.

Other passages, quoted by the members of this Society in favor of their tenet on war are taken from the apostles Paul and James conjointly.

The former, in his second epistle to the Corinthians, says, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; to the casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ‡." From this the Quakers argue that the warfare of Christianity, or that which Christianity recognizes, is not carnal but spiritual, and that it consists in the destruction of the evil imaginations, or of the evil lusts and passions of men; that is, no man can be a true soldier of Christ, unless his lusts are subdued, or unless the carnal be subdued by the spiritual mind. Now this position having been laid down by St. Paul, or the position having been established in Christian morals, that a state of subjugated passions is the great characteristic mark of a true Christian, they draw a conclusion from it by the help of the words of St. James. This apostle, in his Letter to the dispersed Tribes, which were often at war with each other as well as with the Romans, says, "From whence come wars and fightings amongst you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members§?" But if wars come from the lusts of men, then the Quakers say that those, who have subdued their lusts, can no longer engage in them; or, in other words, that true Christians, being persons of this description, or being such according to St. Paul as are redeemed out of what St. James calls the very grounds

---

*Matt. v. 38, &c.

†The Heathen nations, on account of their idolatry, were called enemies by the Jews.

‡2 Cor. x. 3, 4, 5.

§James iv. 1.

and occasions of war, can no longer fight. And as this proposition is true in itself, so they conceive the converse of it to be true also. For if there are persons, on the other hand, who deliberately engage in the wars and fightings of the world, it is a proof that their lusts are not yet subjugated; or that, though they may be nominal, they are not yet arrived at the stature of true or of full-grown Christians.

A third quotation made by the Quakers, is taken from St. Paul exclusively: "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his*;" that is, If men have not the same disposition, which Jesus Christ manifested in the different situations of his life,—the same spirit of humility, and of forbearance, and of love, and of forgiveness of injuries,—or if they do not follow him as a pattern,—or if they do not act as he would have done on any similar occasion,—they are not Christians. Now they conceive, knowing what the Spirit of Jesus was by those things, which have been recorded of him, that he could never have been induced or compelled by any earthly consideration or power to engage in the wars of the world. They are aware that his mission, which it became him to fulfill, and which engrossed all his time, would not allow him the opportunity of a military life. But they believe, independently of this, that the Spirit, which he manifested upon earth, would have been of itself a sufficient bar to such an employment. This they judge from his opinions and his precepts. For how could he have taken up arms to fight who enjoined in the New Dispensation that men were not to resist injuries;—that they were to love their enemies;—that they were to bless those, who cursed them, and to do good to those, who hated them? This they judge also from his practice. For how could he have lifted up his arm against another, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again, and who in his very agony upon the cross prayed for his persecutors, saying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do?" But if Jesus Christ could not have been induced or compelled to engage in a profession, which would have subjected him to take away the life of another, so neither can any Christian;—for, if a man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

Three arguments are usually brought against the Society on this subject.

The first is, that John the baptist†, when the soldiers demanded of him what they should do, did not desire them to leave the service, in which they were engaged, but, on the other hand, to be content with their wages. To this the Quakers reply, that John told them also

---

* Rom. viii. 9. † Luke iii. 14.

"to do violence to no man." But even if he had not said this, they apprehend that nothing could be deduced from his expressions, which could become binding upon Christians. For John was the last prophet of the Old Dispensation, but was never admitted into the New. He belonged to the system, which required an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; but not to that, which required no resistance to evil, and which insisted upon the love of enemies as well as friends. Hence Jesus Christ said of him, that "he who was least in the kingdom heaven was greater than he."

The second argument, brought against the Society on this occasion, is of a similar nature with the former. It is said, that if war had been unlawful, our Savior, when the centurion came to him at Capernaum*, would have found fault with his profession; but he did not do this; on the contrary, he highly commended him for his religion. In answer to this the Quakers observe, first, that no solid argument can be drawn from silence on any occasion. Secondly, that Jesus Christ seems, for wise purposes, to have abstained from meddling with any of the civil institutions of his time, though in themselves wicked: thinking probably that it was sufficient to leave behind him such general precepts, as, when applied properly, would be subversive of them all. And, thirdly, that he never commended the centurion on account of his military situation, but on account of the profession of his faith.

They say, further, that they can bring an argument of a much more positive nature than that just mentioned, from an incident which took place, and in which Jesus was again concerned: When Peter cut off the ear of one of the servants of the high-priest, who was concerned in the apprehension of his Lord, he was not applauded, but reprimanded, for the part which he thus took in his defence, in the following words: "Put up again thy sword in its place; for all they that take the sword shall perish by the sword†." Now the Quakers conceive that much more is to be inferred against the use of the sword from this instance, than from the former in favor of it.

The last argument which is usually adduced against the members of this Society on this subject is, that they have mistaken the meaning of the words of the famous Sermon upon the Mount. These words, it is said, teach us the noble lesson, that it is more consistent with the character of a Christian to forgive than to resent an injury. They are, it is said, wholly of private import, and relate solely to private occurrences in life. But the members of this Society have

---

* Matt. viii. 5. † Mark xxvi. 52.

extended the meaning of them, beyond private, to public injuries or wars.

The Quakers in answer to this observe, that they dare not give to the words in question a less extensive meaning. They relate to every one, who reads them. They relate to the poor. They relate to the rich. They relate to every potentate, who may be the ruler of a land. They relate to every individual of his council. There is no exception or dispensation to any one in favor of any case.

That they relate to public as well as private wars, or that they extend themselves naturally to those which are public, the Quakers conceive it reasonable to suppose from the following consideration: No man, they apprehend, can possess practically the divine principle of loving an individual enemy at home, or of doing good to the man who hates him, but he must of necessity love his enemy in any and every other place. He must have gone so far forward on the road to Christian perfection, as to be unable to bear arms against any other person whatsoever; and particularly when, according to the doctrines of the New Testament, no geographical boundaries fix the limits of love and enmity between man and man, but the whole human race are considered as the children of the same parent, and therefore as brothers to one another. But who can truly love an enemy, and kill him? And where is the difference, under the Gospel-dispensation, between Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Bond and Free?

That these words were meant to extend to public as well as private wars, they believe, again, from the views which they entertain relative to the completion of Prophecy. They believe that a time will come, in one or other of the succeeding ages, "when men shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, and they shall not learn war any more." Now other Christians, who differ from them in the interpretation of the words in question, believe equally with them that the time thus predicted will come to pass. The question then is, whether the more enlarged interpretation of these words, as insisted upon by the Society, or of the less enlarged, as insisted upon by others, be the most consistent with the belief of the future accomplishment of the prophecy just mentioned. And in this case the Quakers are of opinion, that if wars were ever to cease, one ought to expect that some foundation would have been previously laid in Christianity for this great and important end. The subjugation of the passions, which it is the direct tendency of Christianity to effect, would produce this end: and so far such a foundation has already been laid in this system. But as the admis-

sion of moral precepts into the education of man, so as to form habits of moral opinion, is another way of influencing conduct in life, they think it likely that some such maxim as "that Christians should not fight" would have been introduced also; because the adoption of such a maxim would have a similar tendency with the subjugation of the passions in producing the same end. For it seems absurd, they conceive, to suppose that wars should cease, and that no precept should have been held out that they were wrong. But the more enlarged interpretation of the words in question furnishes such a precept, and therefore another foundation seems to have been laid in Christianity for the same end. They admit, therefore, the larger interpretation as included in the less, because it comports more with the design of Providence (who announces by the mouth of his Prophets that he wills universal peace) that the prohibition of private as well as public wars should be understood as a Christian doctrine, than that the words in question should be confined to private injuries alone.

The last reason, which the Quakers give for adopting the larger interpretation of the words in the Sermon upon the Mount as well as the less, is the following: They are of opinion that, as Christians, they ought not to lessen the number of the moral obligations of the Gospel. They ought not to abridge its dignity, nor to put limits to its benevolence. If it was the desire of Jesus Christ that men should love their enemies, it is their duty to believe that his wish could not have been otherwise than universal. If it was an object with him to cure moral evil, it is their duty to suppose that it was his desire to destroy it, not partially, but to the utmost possible extent. If it was his design to give happiness to men, it is their duty to determine that he intended to give it, not in a limited proportion, but in the largest measure. But when they consider the nature of wars,—that they militate against the law of preservation,—that they include the commission of a multitude of crimes,—that they produce a complication of misery and suffering to man,—they conceive the would not be doing their duty as Christians, or giving to Christianity its due honor, if they were not to admit the larger meaning of the words in question as well as the less. Reason, too, pleads for the one as well as for the other. Consistency of moral doctrine, again, demands both. But if we admit the restricted interpretation, and exclude the larger, we offend reason. All consistency is at an end. Individual responsibility for moral turpitude will be taken from man. Crimes, clearly marked and defined in the page of Christianity, will cease to be crimes at the will of princes. One contradiction will rush in after another, and men will have different

standards of morality, as they adhere to the commands of the Gospel, or to the customs of governments, or to the opinions of the world.

SECTION II.

Meaning of the scriptural passages advanced by the Quakers supported by the opinions and practice of the early Christians—Early Christian writers held it unlawful to fight, as appears from Justin, Tatian, Clemens, and others—Christians would not enter into the armies for more than two centuries, as appears from Irenæus, Tertullian, Celsus, Origen, and others—and generally left the military service if they happened to be converted in it.

It may be presumed to be difficult for Christians, who have been in the habit of beholding wars entered into and carried on by their own and other Christian Governments, and without any other censure than that they might be politically wrong, to see the scriptural passages of "non-resistance of injuries, and love of enemies," but through a vitiated medium. The prejudices of some, the interests of others, and custom with all, will induce a belief among them, that these have no relation to public wars. At least they will be glad to screen themselves under such a notion. But the question is, what would a Heathen have said to these passages, who, on his conversion to Christianity, believed that the New Testament was of Divine origin,—that it was the Book of Life,—and that the precepts, which it contained, were not to be dispensed with to suit particular cases, without the imputation of evil. Now such a trial, the Quakers say, has been made. It was made by the first Christians; and they affirm, that these interpreted the passages, which have been mentioned, differently from those of most of the Christians of the present age; for that both their opinions and their practice spoke loudly against the lawfulness of war.

Upon this new subject I shall enter next. And I confess I shall enter upon it willingly. First, because I know of none that is more important: Secondly, because, though controversy may have thrown some light upon it, much remains to be added. And, thirdly, because the assertions of the Society on this point are disputed by many at the present day.

With respect to the opinions of the early Christians, which I shall notice first, it must be premised, that such of them as have written books have not all of them entered upon this subject. Some of them have not had occasion even to notice it. But where they have, and where they have expressed an opinion, I believe that this will be found unfavorable to the continuance of war.

Justin the Martyr, one of the earliest writers in the second cen-

tury, considers war as unlawful. He makes the devil "the author of all war." No severer censure could have been passed upon it than this, when we consider it as coming from the lips of an early Christian. The sentiment, too, was contrary to the prevailing sentiments of the times, when, of all professions, that of war was most honorable, and was the only one that was considered to lead to glory. It resulted therefore, in all probability, from the new views, which Justin had acquired by a perusal of such of the Scriptures as had then fallen into his hands.

Tatian, who was the disciple of Justin, in his Oration to the Greeks, speaks precisely in the same terms on the same subject.

From many expressions of Clemens of Alexandria, a contemporary of the latter, we collect his opinion to be decisive against the lawfulness of war.

Tertullian, who may be mentioned next in order of time, strongly condemned the practice of bearing arms, as it related to Christians. I shall give one or two extracts from him on this subject.:—In his Dissertation on the Worship of Idols, he says: "Though the soldiers came to John, and received a certain form to be observed; and though the centurian believed; yet Jesus Christ, by disarming Peter, disarmed every soldier afterwards; for custom never sanctions an illicit act." And in his Soldier's Garland he says, "Can a Soldier's life be lawful, when Christ has pronounced that he, who lives by the sword, shall perish by the sword? Can one, who professes the peaceable doctrine of the Gospel, be a soldier, when it is his duty not so much as to go to law? And shall he, who is not to revenge his own wrongs, be instrumental in bringing others into chains, imprisonment, torment, death?

Cyprian, in his Epistle to Donatus, takes a view of such customs in his own times as he conceived to be repugnant to the spirit or the letter of the Gospel. In looking at war, which was one of them, he speaks thus: "Suppose thyself," says he, "with me on the top of some very exalted eminence, and from thence looking down upon the appearances of things beneath thee. Let our prospect take in the whole horizon, and let us view, with the indifference of persons not concerned in them, the various motions and agitations of human life. Thou wilt then, I dare say, have a real compassion for the circumstances of mankind, and for the posture, in which this view will represent them. And when thou reflectest upon thy condition, thy thoughts will rise in transports of gratitude and praise to God for having made thy escape from the pollutions of the world. The things thou wilt principally observe will be—the highways beset with robbers; the seas with pirates; encampments, marches, and all the

terrible forms of war and bloodshed. When a single murder is committed, it shall be deemed perhaps a crime; but that crime shall commence a virtue, when committed under the shelter of public authority; so that punishment is not rated by the measure of guilt, but the more enormous the size of the wickedness is, so much the greater is the chance for impunity." These are the sentiments of Cyprian; and that they were the result of his views of Christianity, as taken from the Divine Writings, there can be little doubt. If he had stood upon the same eminence, and beheld the same sights, previously to his conversion, he might, like others, have neither thought piracy dishonorable, nor war inglorious.

Lacantius, who lived some time after Cyprian, in his Treatise concerning the true Worship of God, says, "It can never be lawful for a righteous man to go to war, whose warfare is in righteousness itself." And in another part of the same Treatise he observes, that "no exception can be made with respect to this command of God. It can never be lawful to kill a man, whose person the Divine Being designed to be sacred as to violence."

It will be unnecessary to make extracts from other of the early Christian writers, who mention this subject. I shall therefore only observe, that the names of Origen, Archelaus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome and Cyril, may be added to those already mentioned, as the names of persons, who gave it as their decided opinion, that it was unlawful for Christians to go to war.

With respect to the practice of the early Christians, which is the next point to be considered, it may be observed, that there is no well authenticated instance upon record of Christians entering into the army for the first two centuries; but it is true, on the other hand, that they declined the military profession, as one in which it was not lawful for them to engage.

The first species of evidence, which I shall produce to this point, may be found in the following facts, which reach from the year 169 to the year 198: Avidius Crassus had rebelled against the emperor Verus, and was slain. In a short time afterwards, Clodius Albinus in one part of the world, and Pencennius Niger in another, rebelled against the emperor Severus, and both were slain likewise. Now suspicion fell, as it always did in these times, if anything went wrong, upon the Christians, as having been concerned upon these occasions. But Tertullian, in his Discourse to Scapula, tells us that no Christians were to be found in these armies. And yet these armies were extensive. Crassus was master of all Syria with its four legions, Niger of the Asiatic and Egyptian legions, and Albinus of those of Britain; which legions together contained between a third and a half of the

standing legions of Rome. And the fact, that no Christians were then to be found in these, is the more remarkable, because, according to the same Tertullian, Christianity had reached all the places, in which these armies were.

A second species of evidence, as far as it goes, may be collected from expressions and declarations in the works of certain authors of those times. Justin the Martyr and Tatian make distinctions between soldiers and Christians; and the latter says, that the Christians declined even military commands. Clemens of Alexandria gives the Christians, who were contemporary with him, the appellation of "Peaceable," or of "the Followers of Peace;" thus distinguishing them from the soldiers of his age. And he says expressly, that "those who were the followers of peace, used none of the instruments of war."

A third species of evidence, which is of the highest importance in this case, is the belief, which the writers of these times had, that the prophecy of Isaiah, which stated that men should turn their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruninghooks, was then in the act of completion.

Irenæus, who flourished about the year 180, affirms that this famous prophecy had been completed in his time; "for the Christians," says he, "have changed their swords and their lances into instruments of peace, and they know not how to fight." Justin Martyr, who was contemporary with Irenæus, asserted the same thing; which he could not have done if the Christians of his time had engaged in war. "That the prophecy," says he, "is fulfilled, you have good reason to believe; for we, who in times past killed one another, do not now fight with our enemies." And here it is observable, that the word "fight" does not mean to strike, or to beat, or to give a blow, but to fight as in war; and the word "enemy" does not mean a common adversary, or one who has injured us, but an enemy of the State: and the sentence, which follows that which has been given, puts the matter out of all doubt. Turtullian, who lived after these, speaks in these remarkable words: "Deny that these (meaning the turning of swords into ploughshares) are the things prophesied of, when you see what you see; or that they are the things fulfilled, when you read what you read: but if you deny neither of these positions, then you must confess, that the prophecy has been accomplished as far as the practice of every individual is concerned, to whom it is applicable." I might go from Turtullian even as far as Theodoret, if it were necessary, to show that the prophecy in question was considered as in the act of completion in those times.

The fourth and last proof will be found in the assertions of Celsus,

and in the reply of Origen to that writer. Celsus, who lived at the end of the second century, attacked the Christian religion. He made it one of his charges against the Christians, that they refused in his time to bear arms for the emperor, even in the case of necessity, and when their services would have been accepted. He told them further, that if the rest of the empire were of their opinion, it would soon be overrun by the Barbarians. Now Celsus dared not have brought this charge against the Christians, if the fact had not been publicly known. But let us see whether it was denied by those, who were of opinion that his work demanded a reply. The person, who wrote against him in favor of Christianity, was Origen, who lived in the third century. But Origen, in his answer, admits the fact as stated by Celsus, that the Christians would not bear arms, and justifies them for refusing the practice, on the principle of the unlawfulness of war.

And as the early Christians would not enter into the armies, so there is good ground to suppose that, when they became converted in them, they relinquished their profession. Human nature was the same both in and out of the armies, and would be equally worked upon in this new state of things in both cases. Accordingly we find from Turtullian, in his Soldier's Garland, "that many in his time, immediately on their conversion, quitted the military service." We are told also by Archelaus, who flourished under Probus in the year 278, that many Roman soldiers, who had embraced Christianity after having witnessed the piety and generosity of Marcellus, immediately forsook the profession of arms. We are told also by Eusebius, that, about the same time, "Numbers laid aside a military life, and became private persons, rather than abjure their religion." And here it may not be unworthy of remark, that soldiers, after their conversion, became so troublesome in the army, both on account of their scruples against the idolatrous practices required of the soldiery, and their scruples against fighting, that they were occasionally dismissed the service on these accounts.

SECTION III.

Objection to the foregoing statement; namely, that the idolatry, which was then connected with the military service, and not the unlawfulness of war, was the reason why Christians declined it—idolatry admitted to be a cause—instance in Marinus—but the belief of the unlawfulness of fighting was another and an equally powerful cause—instances in Maximilian—Marcellus—Cassian—Martin—the one scruple as much, then, a part of the Christian religion as the other.

As an objection may be made to the foregoing statement, I think it proper to notice it in this place.

It will be said that the military oath, which all were obliged to take alike in the Roman armies, and which was to be repeated annually, was full of idolatry; that the Roman standards were all considered as gods, and had divine honors paid to them by the soldiery; and that the images also of the emperors, which were either fixed upon these standards, or placed in the midst of them in a temple in the camp, were to be adored in the same manner. Now, these customs were interwoven with the military service. No Roman soldier was exempted from them. It will be urged, therefore, that no Christian could submit to these services. Indeed, when a person was suspected of being a Christian in those times, he was instantly taken to the altars to sacrifice; it being notorious that, if he were a Christian, he would not sacrifice though at the hazard of his life. Is it not therefore to be presumed that these idolatrous tests operated as the great cause why Christians refused to enter into the army, or why they left it when converted, as described in the former section?

That these tests operated as a cause, we must allow; and let this be considered as an insuperable argument against those who contend that there were Christian soldiers in these times; for no Christian could submit to such idolatrous homage; but if so, no Christian could be a soldier.

That these tests must have operated as a cause, we may infer from the history of Marinus. Marinus, according to Eusebius, was a man of family and fortune, and an officer in a legion, which, in the year 260, was stationed at Cæsarea of Palestine. One of the centurion's rods happened to become vacant in this legion, and Marinus was appointed to it. But just at this moment, another, next to him in rank, accused him before the tribunal of being a Christian, stating, "that the laws did not allow a Christian, who refused to sacrifice to the emperors, to hold any dignity in the army." Achæus, the judge, asked Marinus if it was true that he had become a Christian. He acknowledged it. Three hours were then allowed him to consider, whether he would sacrifice or die. When the time was expired, he chose the latter. Indeed so desirous were the early Christians of keeping clear of idolatry in every shape, that they avoided every custom that appeared in the least degree connected with it. Thus, when a largess was given in honor of the emperors L. Septimus Severus the father, and M. Aurelius Caracalla the son, a solitary soldier, as we learn from Turtullian, was seen carrying the garland, which had been given him on that occasion, in his hand, while the rest wore it upon their heads. On being interrogated by the commander why he refused wearing it, he replied, "that he had become

a Christian*." He was immediately punished before the army, and sent into prison. What became of him afterwards is not related. But it must be clear, if he lived and cherished his Christian feelings, that when the day of the renewal of his oath, or of the worshipping of the standards, or of any sacrifice in the camp, should arrive, he would refuse these services, or abandon his profession.

But though unquestionably the idolatrous services required of the soldiers of those times hindered Christians from entering into the armies, and compelled those who were converted in them to leave them, nothing is more true, than that the belief that it was unlawful for Christians to fight occasioned an equal abhorrence of a military life. One of the first effects, which Christianity seems to have produced upon its first converts, when it was pure and unadulterated, and unmixed with the interpretations of political men, was a persuasion that it became them, in obedience to the Divine commands, to abstain from all manner of violence, and to become distinguishable as the followers of peace. We find accordingly from Athenagoras and other early writers, that the Christians of his time abstained when they were struck from striking again, and that they carried their principles so far as even to refuse to go to law with those who injured them. We find also from the same Athenagoras, and from Theophilus Antiochenus, Tatian, Minucius Felix, and others, that they kept away from the shows of the gladiators. This they did, not only because these shows were cruel, but because, as Theophilus says, "lest we should become partakers of the murders committed there." A similar reason is also given by Athenagoras on this occasion: "Who is there," says he, "that does not prize the shows of the gladiators, which your emperors make for the people? But we, thinking that there is very little difference whether a man be the author or spectator of murder, keep away from all such sights." And here it may be observed, that the gladiators themselves were generally prisoners of war or reputed enemies, and that the murder of these was by public authority, and sanctioned, as in war, by the State. Now what conclusion are we to draw from these premises? Can we think it possible, that they, who refused to strike again, or to go to law with those who injured them, and who thought an attendance at the gladiatorial spectacles criminal, on the principle that he who stood by was a murderer though the murder was sanctioned by law, should not have had an objection to the military servive, on the principle that it was unlawful to fight?

In short, the belief of the unlawfulness of war was universal

* The priests wore the garland when they sacrificed to the Heathen gods.

among Christians in those times. Every Christian writer of the second century, who notices the subject, makes it unlawful for Christians to bear arms. And if the Christian writers of this age were of this opinion, contrary to all their sentiments before their conversion, and wholly from their knowledge of Divine truths,—why should not others, who had a common nature with these, be impressed on receiving the same truths, in a similar manner? And so undoubtedly they were. And as this belief was universal among the Christians of those times, so it operated with them as an impediment to a military life, quite as much as the idolatry that was connected with it; of which the following instances, in opposition to that of Marinus, may suffice.

The first case I purpose to mention shall be, where there was an objection to entering into the military service upon this principle. And here I apprehend none can be more in point than that of Maximilian, as preserved in the Acts of Ruinart.

Maximilian having been brought before the tribunal, in order to be enrolled as a soldier, Dion, the proconsul, asked him his name. Maximilian, turning to him, replied, "Why wouldst thou know my name? I am a Christian, and cannot fight."

Then Dion ordered him to be enrolled; and when he was enrolled, it was recited out of the register that he was five feet ten inches high. Immediately after this, Dion bade the officer mark him. But Maximilian refused to be marked, still asserting that he was a Christian. Upon which Dion instantly replied, "Bear arms, or thou shalt die."

To this Maximilian answered, "I cannot fight, if I die: I am not a soldier of this world, but a soldier of God." Dion then said, "Who has persuaded thee to behave thus?" Maximilian answered, "My own mind, and He who has called me." Dion then spoke to his father, and bade him persuade his son. But his father observed, that his son knew his own mind, and what it was best for him to do.

After this had passed, Dion addressed Maximilian again in these words: "Take thy arms, and receive the mark." "I can receive," says Maximilian, "no such mark. I have already the mark of Christ." Upon which Dion said, "I will send thee quickly to thy Christ."—"Thou mayst do so," says Maximilian, "but the glory will be mine."

Dion then bade the officer mark him. But Maximilian still persisted in refusing, and spoke thus: "I connot receive the mark of this world. And if thou shouldst give me the mark, I will destroy it. It will avail nothing. I am a Christian, and it is not lawful for me to wear such a mark about my neck, when I have received the

saving mark of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God, whom thou knowest not, who died to give us life, and whom God gave for our sins. Him all we Christians obey. Him we follow, as the Restorer of our life and the Author of our salvation."

Dion instantly replied to this, "Take thy arms and receive the mark, or thou shalt suffer a miserable death."—"But I shall not perish," said Maximilian. "My name is already enrolled with Christ. I cannot fight."

Dion said, "Consider, then, thy youth, and bear arms. The profession of arms becomes a young man." Maximilian replied, "My arms are with the Lord. I cannot fight for any earthly consideration. I am now a Christian."

Dion, the proconsul, said, "Among the life-guards of our masters Dioclesian and Maximian, and Constantius and Maximus, there are Christian soldiers, and they fight." Maximilian answered, "They know best what is expedient for them; but I am a Christian, and it is unlawful to do evil."

Dion said, "Take thy arms. Despise not the profession of a soldier, lest thou perish miserably."—"But I shall not perish," says Maximilian; "and if I should leave this world, my soul will live with Christ the Lord."

Dion then ordered his name to be struck from the roll; and when this was done he proceeded: "Because out of thy rebellious spirit thou hast refused to bear arms, thou shalt be punished according to thy deserts, for an example to others; and then he delivered the following sentence: "Maximilian! because thou hast with a rebellious spirit refused to bear arms, thou art to die by the sword." Maximilian relied, "Thanks be to God."

He was twenty years three months and seventeen days old; and when he was led to the place of execution he spoke thus: "My dear brethren, endeavor with all your might, that it may be your portion to see the Lord, and that he may give you such a crown." And then with a pleasant countenance he said to his father, "Give the executioner the soldier's coat thou hadst gotten for me; and when I shall receive thee in the company of the blessed martyrs, we may rejoice together with the Lord."

After this he suffered. His mother Pompeiana obtained his body of the judge, and conveyed it to Carthage, and buried it near the place where the body of Cyprian the martyr lay. And thirteen days after this his mother died, and was buried in the same place. And Victor, his father, returned to his habitation, "rejoicing and praising God that he had sent before such a gift to the Lord, himself expecting to follow after."

I shall only observe upon this instance, that it is nearly pure and unmixed, or that it is but little connected with idolatrous circumstances; or rather, that the unlawfulness of fighting was principally urged by Maximilian as a reason against entering upon a military life. Let us now find a case where, when a person was converted in the army, he left it, pleading this principle as one among others for his dereliction of it:

Marcellus was a centurion in the legion called "Trajana." On a festival given in honor of the birth-day of Galerious, he threw down his military belt at the head of the legion, and, in the face of the standards, declared with a loud voice, that he would no longer serve in the army, for that "he had become a Christian."—"I hold in detestation," says he, addressing himself to all the soldiers, "the worship of your gods—gods, which are made of wood and stone,—gods which are deaf and dumb." So far Marcellus, it appears, seems to have been influenced in his desertion of a military life by the idolatry connected with it. But let us hear him further on this subject: "It is not lawful," says he, "for a Christian, who is a servant of Christ the Lord, to bear arms for any earthly consideration." After a delay of more than three months in prison, which delay was allowed for the purpose of sparing him, he was brought before the præfect. Here he had an opportunity of correcting his former expressions. But as he persisted in the same sentiments, he suffered. It is remarkable that, almost immediately after his execution, Cassian, who was the notary to the same legion, refused to serve any longer, by publicly throwing his pen and account-book upon the ground, and declaring at the same time that the sentence of Marcellus was unjust. When taken up by the order of Aurelianus Agricolanus, he is described by the record preserved by Ruinart, to have avowed the same sentiments as Marcellus, and like him to have suffered death.

It may not, perhaps, be necessary to cite any other instances, as opposed to that of Marinus, to the point in question. But as another occurs, which may be related in a few words, I will just mention it in this place: Martin, of whom Sulpicius Severus says so much, had been bred to the profession of arms, but on his conversion to Christianity declined it. In the answer, which he gave to Julian the Apostate for his conduct on this occasion, we find him making use only of these words: "I am a Christian, and therefore I cannot fight."

Now this answer of Martin is detached from all notions of idolatry. The unlawfulness of fighting is given as the only motive for his resignation. And there is no doubt that the unlawfulness of

fighting was as much a principle of religion in the early times of Christianity, as the refusal of sacrifice to the Heathen gods; and that they operated equally to prevent men from entering into the army, and to drive them out of it on their conversion. Indeed these principles generally went together, where the profession of arms presented itself as an occupation for a Christian. He who refused the profession on account of the idolatry connected with it, would have refused it on account of the unlawfulness of fighting. And he, who refused it on account of the guilt of fighting, would have refused on account of the idolatrous services it required. In the early times of Christianity each of them was a powerful impediment to a military life.

SECTION IV.

Early Christians then declined the army on account of one among other persuasions, that it was unlawful for Christians to fight—their practice examined further, or into the fourth century—shown from hence that while Christianity continued pure, Christians still declined the military profession—but as it became less pure, their scruples against it became less—and when it became corrupt, their scruples against it ceased—Manner in which the Quakers make the practice of those early times support the meaning of the scriptural passages which they adduce in favor of their tenet on war.

As it will now probably be admitted that the early Christians refused to enter into the army, and that they left it after their conversion, on account of one among other persuasions that it was unlawful for them to fight, I must examine their practice as it related to this subject still further; or I must trace it down to a later period, before I can show how the Quakers make the practice of those early times support the meaning of the scriptural passages, which they advance in favor of their tenet on war.

It may be considered as a well-founded proposition, that as the lamp of Christianity burned bright in those early times, so those, who were illuminated by it, declined the military profession; and that as its flames shone less clear, they had less objection to it. Thus, in the two first centuries, when Christianity was the purest, there were no Christian soldiers. In the third century, when it became less pure, there is frequent mention of such soldiers. And in the fourth, when its corruption was fixed, Christians entered upon the profession of arms with as little hesitation as they entered upon any other occupation in life.

That there were no Christian soldiers in the first and second centuries has already been made apparent.

That Christianity also was purest in these times there can be no doubt. Let us look at the character, which is given of the first

Christians by Athenagoras, Justin Martyr, Minucius Felix, and others of the early Christian writers. According to these, they were plain and neat in their apparel, and frugal in their furniture. They were temperate in their eating and drinking. They relinquished all the diversions of the times, in which they saw any tendency to evil. They were chaste in their conversation, tempering mirth with gravity. They were modest and chaste in their deportment and manners. They were punctual to their words and engagements. They were such lovers of truth, that, on being asked if they were Christians, they never denied it, though death was the consequence of such a religious profession. They loved each other as brethren, and called one another by that name, They were kind and courteous, and charitable beyond all example, to others. They abstained from all manner of violence. They prayed for those who persecuted them. They were patterns of humility and patience. They made no sacrifice of their consciences, but would persevere in that which was right, never refusing to die for their religion. This is the character, which is uniformly given of them by the Christian writers of those times.

That their conduct was greatly altered in the third century, where we are now to view it, we may collect from indisputable authority. I stated in a former section, that a Christian soldier was punished for refusing to wear a garland, like the rest of his comrades, on a public occasion. This man, it appears, had been converted in the army, and objected to the ceremony on that account. Now Tertullian tells us that this soldier was blamed for his unseasonable zeal, as it was called, by some of the Christians of that time, though all Christians before considered the wearing of such a garland as unlawful and profane. In this century there is no question but the Christian discipline began to relax. To the long peace that the Church enjoyed, from the death of Antoninus to the tenth year of Severus, is to be ascribed the corruption that ensued. This corruption we find to have spread rapidly: for the same Tertullian was enabled to furnish us with the extraordinary instance of manufacturers of idols being admitted into the ecclesiastical order. Many corruptions are also noticed in this century by other writers. Cyprian complained of them as they existed in the middle, and Eusebius as they existed at the end of it; and both attributed it to the peace, or to the ease and plenty, which the Christians had enjoyed. The latter gives us a melancholy account of their change. They had begun to live in fine houses, and to indulge in luxuries. But, above all, they had begun to be envious, and quarrelsome, and to dissemble, and to cheat, and to falsify their word,—so they lost the character which Pliny, an adversary to their religion, had been obliged to give of them, and

which they had retained for more than a century, as appears by their own writers.

That there were Christian soldiers in this more corrupt century of the Church, it is impossible to deny; for such frequent mention is made of them in the histories, which relate to this period, that we can not refuse our assent to one or other of the propositions, either that there were men in the armies who called themselves Christians, or that there were men in them who had that name given them by others. That they were Christians, however, is another question. They were probably such Christians as Dion mentioned to have been among the life-guards of Dioclesian and Maximian, and of Constantius and Maximus, of whom Maximilian observed, "These men may know best what it is expedient for them to do; but I am a Christian, and therefore I can not fight." Indeed that real Christians could have been found in the army in this century is impossible; for the military oath, which was full of idolatry, and the adoration of the standards, and the performance of sacrifice, still continued as services* not to be dispensed with by the soldiery. No one therefore can believe that men in the full practice of Pagan idolatry, as every legionary soldier must then have been, were real Christians, merely because it is recorded in history that men, calling themselves Christians, were found in the army in those times. On the other hand, if any soldiers professed Christianity at this period, or are related by authors to have professed it, and yet to have remained soldiers, it may be directly pronounced, that they could only have been nominal or corrupted Christians.

That Christianity was more degenerate in the fourth than in the third century (which is the next position) we have indubitable proof. One of the first facts which strike us, is an extraordinary one related by Lactantius in his "Death of the persecuted," namely, that there were Christians at this time who, having probably a superstitious belief that the sign of the cross would be a preventive of pollution, were present and even assisted at some of the Heathen sacrifices. But it is not necessary to detail these or other particulars. Almost every body knows that more evils sprung up to the Church in this century than in any other; some of which remain at the present day. Indeed the corruption of Christianity was fixed as it were by law in the age now mentioned. Constantine, on his conversion, introduced many of the Pagan ceremonies and superstitions, in which

*The military oath was not altered for Christians till the next century, when they were allowed to swear "by God, by Christ, and by the Holy Spirit, and by the Majesty of the Emperor, which, next to God, is to be loved and honored by mankind."

he had been brought up, into the Christian religion. The Christians, rejoiced at seeing an emperor of their own persuasion, under whom they had hopes of restoration to equal privileges with others, and of freedom from persecution, submitted, in order to please or flatter him, to his idolatrous customs and opinions,—thus sacrificing their consciences to their ease and safety. Many, on the other hand, who had always been Heathens, professed themselves Christians at once, out of compliment to their emperor, and without any real conversion of the heart. Thus there was a mixture of Christianity and Paganism in the Church, which had never been known before. Constantine, too, retained the blasphemous titles of Eternity, Divinity, and Pontifex Maximus, as they had been given to his predecessors. After his death he was considered also as a god. And, if Philostorgius is to be believed, the Christians, for so he calls them, prayed to and worshipped him as such.

Now in this century, when the corruption of the Church may be considered to have been fixed, we scarcely find any mention of Christian soldiers, or we find the distinction between them and others gradually passing away. The truth is, that when the Christians of this age had submitted to certain innovations upon their religion, they were in a fit state to go greater lengths, and so it happened: for as Heathens, who professed to be Christians out of compliment to their emperor, had no objection to the military service,—so Christians, who had submitted to Heathenism on the same principle, relaxed in their scruples concerning it. The latter, too, were influenced by the example of the former. Hence the unlawfulness of fighting began to be given up. We find, however, that here and there an ancient Father still retained it as a religious tenet; but these dropping off one after another, it ceased at length to be a doctrine of the Church.

Having now traced the practice of the Christians down to the fourth century, as far as the profession of arms is concerned, I shall state in few words the manner in which the Quakers make this practice support the meaning of the scriptural passages which they produce in favor of their tenet on war.

The Quakers, then, lay it down as a position, that the Christians of the first and second centuries, as we have already observed, gave the same interpretation as they themselves give of the passages in question.

Now they say, first, that if there were any words of expressions in the original manuscripts of the Evangelists or Apostles, which might throw light upon the meaning of these or other passages on the same subject, but which words and expressions were not in the copies which came after, then many of these, who lived in the first and

second centuries, had advantages with respect to knowledge on this subject, which their successors had not, inasmuch as the former were soon afterward lost.

They say, secondly, that if there was anything in tradition, which might help to explain these passages more satisfactorily, those of the first and second centuries had advantages, again, because they lived nearer to these traditions, or to the time when they were more pure, than those Christians, who succeeded them.

They say, thirdly, that if primitive practice be to be considered as the best interpreter of the passages in question, then those of the first and second centuries had their advantages, again, because many of them lived in the times of the Evangelists and Apostles, and all of them nearer to those, who succeeded the Evangelists and Apostles, than those in the subsequent ages of the Christian æra.

But a direct inference, they conceive, is to be drawn from these premises; namely, that the opinions of those, who lived in the first and second centuries, relative to the meaning of the passages in question are likely to be more correct, on these several accounts, than those of Christians in any of the ages that followed.

And as in the first and second centuries of the Church, when Christianity was purest, there were no Christian soldiers; but as in the fourth century, when it became corrupt, Christians had lost their objections to a military life; they conceive the opinions of the former to be more correct than those of the latter, because the opinions of real Christians, willing to make any sacrifice for religion, must be always less biassed and more pure than those of persons calling themselves Christians, but yet submitting to the idolatrous and other corrupt practices of the world.

And as they conceive this to be true of the opinions of the second century, when compared with those of the fourth, so they conceive it to be true of the opinions of the second, when compared with those of the moderns upon this subject; because, whatever our progress in Christianity may be, seeing that it is not equal to that of the first Christians, it is certain, besides the distance of time, that we have prejudices arising from the practice of fourteen centuries, during all which time it has been held out, except by a few individuals, as lawful for Christians to fight.

SECTION V.

Reflections of the Author on the foregoing subject—Case of a Superior Being supposed, who should reside in the planet nearest to us, and see war carried on by men no larger than the race of ants—his inquiry as to the origin of

these wars—their duration—and other circumstances—supposed answers to these questions—new arguments from this supposed conversation against war.

I HAVE now stated the principal arguments, by which the Quakers are induced to believe it to be a doctrine of Christianity that men should abstain from war; and I intended to close the subject in the last section. But when I consider the frequency of modern wars,—when I consider that they are scarcely over before others rise up in their place;—when I consider, again, that they come like the common diseases, which belong to our infirm nature, and that they are considered by men nearly in a similar light,—I should feel myself criminal, if I were not to avail myself of the privilege of an author to add a few observations of my own upon this subject.

Living as we do in an almost inaccessible island, and having therefore more than ordinary means of security to our property and our persons from hostile invasion, we do not seem to be sufficiently grateful to the Divine Being for the blessings we enjoy. We do not seem to make a right use of our benefits, by contemplating the situation, and by feeling a tender anxiety for the happiness, of others. We seem to make no proper estimates of the miseries of war. The latter we feel principally in abridgments of a pecuniary nature. But if we were to feel them in the conflagration of our towns and villages, or in personal wounds, or in the personal sufferings of fugitive misery and want, we should be apt to put a greater value than we do upon the blessings of peace. And we should be apt to consider the connection between war and misery, and between war and moral evil, in a light so much stronger than we do at present, that we might even suppose the precepts of Jesus Christ to be deficient, unless they were made to extend to wars as well as to private injuries.

I wonder what a Superior Being, living in the nearest planet to our earth, and seeing us of the size of ants, would say, if he were enabled to get any insight into the nature of modern wars.

It must certainly strike him, if he were to see a number of such diminutive persons chasing one another in bodies over different parts of the hills and valleys of the earth, and following each other in little nut-shells as it were upon the ocean, as a very extraordinary sight, and as mysterious, and hard to be explained. He might at first consider them as occupied in a game of play, or as migrating for more food, or for a better climate. But when he saw them stop and fight, and destroy one another, and was assured that they were actually engaged in the solemn game of death, and this at such a distance from their own homes, he would wonder at the causes of these movements, and the reason of this destruction; and, not knowing that

they possessed rational faculties, he would probably consider them as animals destined by nature to live upon one another.

I think the first question he would ask would be, And from whence do these fightings come? It would be replied, of course, that they came from their lusts;—that these beings, though diminutive in their appearance, were men;—that they had pride and ambition;—that they had envy and jealousy;—that they indulged also hatred, and malice, and avarice, and anger;—and that on account of some or other of these causes they quarrelled and fought with one another.

Well:—but the Superior Being would say, Is there no one on the earth, which I see below me, to advise them to conduct themselves better; or are the passions you speak of eternally predominant and never to be subdued? The reply would of course be, that in these little beings, called men, there had been implanted the faculty of reason, by the use of which they must know that their conduct was exceptionable, but that in these cases they seldom minded it. It would also be added in reply, that they had a religion, which was not only designed by a Spirit from heaven, who had once lived amongst them, but had been pronounced by him, as efficacious to the end proposed; that one of the great objects of this religion was a due subjugation of their passions; and this was so much insisted upon, that no one of them was considered to have received this religion truly unless his passions were subdued. But here the Superior Being would inquire, whether they acknowledged the religion spoken of, and the authority from whence it came. To which it would of course be replied, that they were so tenacious of it, notwithstanding their indulgence of their passions, and their destruction of one another, that you could not offend them more grievously than by telling them that they did not belong to the religion they professed.

It is not difficult to foresee what other questions this Superior Being would ask; and probably the first of these would be, the duration of the lives of these little beings, and the length and frequency of their wars. It would be replied to these, that their lives were but as a vapor, which appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away, and that a quarter and sometimes half of their time on earth was spent in these destructive pursuits. Their Superior being would unquestionably be grieved at this account, because he would feel that they really frustrated their own happiness, or that they lost by their own fault a considerable portion of the enjoyment of their lives.

In this impatience and anxiety for their future comfort he would probably ask, again, if they had any notion of any generous end, for which they were born; for it is impossible they could suppose

that they came into the world to destroy one another. It would be replied that they could not be ignorant of the true object or end; for the same religion, in which they believed, and which was said before to have been given them by a Spirit sent from heaven, inculcated, that they were sent there on a life of trial, and that in a future existence they were to give an account of their conduct, and were to be rewarded or punished accordingly. The same religion, it would be replied also, inculcated, notwithstanding their fightings, the utmost benevolence from one towards another. It wished so much every one of them to live peaceably, that it enjoined it as a duty rather to put up with an injury than to resent it; and it carried its benevolence so far, that it made no distinction between others of the same species, who spoke a different language, or lived in other districts or parts of the same world.

But here the Superior Being would interrupt. What! he would say, Are they not to resent injuries, and yet do they go to war? And are they not afraid of fighting in this manner, when they are to give an account of their conduct in a future state? It would be replied, No. They have their philosophers among them; and most of these have determined, that in this particular case responsibility lies at the door of those, who employ them. But, notwithstanding this, there are others living among them, who think otherwise. These are of opinion, that they, who employ them, cannot take the responsibility upon themselves, without taking it from those, whom they thus employ. But the religion of the Great Spirit no where says, that any constituted authorities among them can take away the responsibility of individual creatures; but, on the other hand, in the most positive terms, that every individual creature is responsible wholly for himself. And this religion does not give any creature an exemption on account of any force, which may be used against him; because no one, according to its precepts, is to do evil, not even that good may come. But, if he be persecuted, he is to adhere to that which is right, and to expect his reward in the other state. The impossibility, therefore, of breaking or dissolving individual responsibility, in the case of immoral action, is an argument to many of the unlawfulness of these wars. And they, who reason in this manner, think they have reasoned right, when they consider, besides, that if any of the beings in question were to kill one of his usually reputed enemies in the time of peace, he would suffer death for it, and would be considered as accountable also for his crime in a future state. They cannot see, therefore, how any constituted authorities among them can alter the nature of things, or how these beings can kill others in time of war without the imputation of a crime, whom

they could not kill without such an imputation in time of peace. They see in the Book of the Great Spirit no dispensation given to societies to alter the nature of actions which it has pronounced to be crimes.

But the Superior Being would say, Is it really defined, and is it defined clearly in the Great Book of the Spirit, that if one of them should kill another he is guilty of a crime? It would be replied, not only of a crime, but of the greatest of all crimes; and that no dispensation is given to any of them to commit it in any case. And it would be observed, further, that there are other crimes, which these fightings generally include, which are equally specified and forbidden in the Great Book, but which they think it proper to sanction in the present case. Thus all kinds of treachery and deceit are considered to be allowable; for a very ancient philosopher among them has left a maxim upon record, and it has not yet been beaten out of their heads, notwithstanding the precepts of the Great Book, in nearly the following words: "Who thinks of requiring open courage of an enemy, or that treachery is not equally allowable in war*?"

Strange! the Superior Being would reply. They seem to me to be reversing the order of their nature, and the end of their existence. But how do they justify themselves on these occasions? It would be answered,—they not only justify themselves, but they even go so far as to call these fightings honorable. The greater the treachery, if it succeed, and the greater the number of these beings killed, the more glorious is the action esteemed.

Still more strange! the Superior Being would reply. And is it possible, he would add, that they enter into this profession with a belief that they are entering into an honorable employ? Some of them, it would be replied, consider it as a genteel employ; and hence they engage in it. Others, of a lazy disposition, prefer it to any other. Others are decoyed into it by treachery in various ways. There are also strong drinks which they are fond of; and if they are prevailed upon to take these to excess they lose their reason, and then they are obliged to submit to the engagements, which they had made in a state of intoxication. It must be owned, too, that when these wars begin, the trades of many of these little beings are stopped; so that, to get a temporary livelihood, they go out and fight. Nor must it be concealed, that many are forced to go, both against their judgment and against their will.

The Superior Being, hurt at these various accounts, would probably ask, And what then does the community get by these wars,

---

* Dolus an virtus quis in hoste requiat?

as a counterbalance for the loss of so much happiness, and the production of so much evil? It would be replied,—nothing. The community is generally worse off at the end of these wars than when it began to contend. But here the Superior Being would wish to hear no more of the system. He would suddenly turn away his face, and retire into one of the deep valleys of his planet, either with exclamations against the folly, or with emotions of pity for the situation, or with expressions of disgust at the wickedness, for these little creatures.

"O for a lodge in some vast wilderness,
Some boundless contiguity of shade,
Where rumor of oppression and deceit,
Of unsuccessful or successful war,
Might never reach me more! My ear is pain'd,
My soul is sick with every day's report
Of wrong and outrage with which earth is filled—
Lands, intersected by a narrow frith,
Abhor each other. Mountains interpos'd
Make enemies of nations, who had else,
Like kindred drops, been mingled into one.—
Thus man devotes his brother and destroys—
Then what is man? And what man, seeing this,
And having human feelings, does not blush,
And hang his head, to think himself a man?"

COWPER.

SECTION VI.

Subject further examined—Sad conceptions of those, relative to the Divine Being and the nature of the Gospel, who plead for the necessity of war—war necessary, where statesmen pursue the policy of the world—nature and tendency of this policy—but not necessary, where they pursue the policy of the Gospel—nature and tendency of this policy—this tendency further confirmed by a supposed case of a few Quakers becoming the Governors of the world.

It is now an old maxim, and time with all its improvements, has not worn it away, that wars are necessary in the present constitution of the world. It has not even been obliterated, that they are necessary in order to sweep off mankind on account of the narrow boundaries of the earth. But they, who make use of this argument, must be aware that, in espousing it, they declare no less than that God, in the formation of his system, had only half calculated or half provided for its continuance; and that they charge him with a worse cruelty than is recorded of the worst of men: because, if he told men to increase and multiply, and gave them passions accordingly, it would appear as if he had created them only to enjoy an eternal feast in the sight of their destruction. Nor do they make him a

moral governor of the world, if he allows men to butcher one another without an individual provocation or offense.

Neither do persons arguing for the necessity of wars do less than set themselves above the prophecies or oracles of God, which declare that such warfare shall some time or other cease.

Neither do they, when they consider wars as necessary, and as never to be done away, on account of the wicked passions of men, do less than speak blasphemy against the Gospel of Jesus Christ; because they proclaim it to be inadequate to the end proposed.

For the proper subjugation of these, among other purposes, it was, that the Gospel was promulgated. If it be thought a miracle that the passions of men should be subdued, it is still a miracle, which Christianity professes to work;—which it has worked since the hour of its institution;—which it has worked in men, who have placed their highest reputation in martial glory;—and which it continues to work at the present day. Those, therefore, who promote wars, and excite the passions of men for this purpose, attempt to undo what it is the object of Christianity to do, and to stop the benign influence of the Gospel in the hearts of men.

That wars are necessary, or rather that they will be begun and continued, I do not mean to deny, while statesmen pursue the wisdom or policy of the world.

What this wisdom or policy is, it will not be difficult to trace.—And, first, when any matter is in dispute among the rulers of nations, it is not a maxim that a high tone is desirable in the settlement of it, in order that the parties may seem to betray neither fear nor weakness, and that they may not be thought to lose any of their dignity or spirit? Now, as the human passions are constituted, except they have been previously brought under due regulation by Christianity, what is more likely than that a high tone of language on one side should beget a similar tone on the other; or that spirit, once manifested, should produce spirit in return; and that each should fly off as it were at a greater distance from accommodation than before, and that when once exasperation has begun it should increase? Now what is the chance, if such policy be resorted to on such occasions, of the preservation of peace between them?

And, secondly, is it not also a received maxim, that in controversies of this sort, a nation even during the discussion should arm itself, in order that it may show itself prepared? But if any one nation arms during the discussion,—if it fits out armies or fleets of observation, with a view of deterring or of being ready, in case of necessity, of striking, as it is called, the first blow,—what is more probable than that the other will arm also, and that it will fit out its

own armies and fleets likewise? But when both are thus armed, pride and spirit will scarcely suffer them to relax; and what is then more probable than that they will begin to fight?

And, thirdly, is it not a maxim also, that even during the attempt to terminate the dispute the public mind should be prepared? Are not the public papers let loose, to excite and propagate a flame? Are not the deeds of our ancestors ushered into our ears, to produce a martial spirit? But if the national temper be roused on both sides, and if preparations are carrying on at the same time with the utmost vigor,—where, again, is the hope of the prevention of war between them?

And, fourthly, after hostilities have commenced, is it not a maxim also to perpetuate the enmity, which has been thus begun, and to give it a deeper root, and even to make it perpetual by connecting it with religion? Thus, flag staffs are exhibited upon steeples, bells are rung to announce victories, and sermons are preached as occasions arise; as if the places allotted for Christian worship were the most proper from whence to issue the news of human suffering, or to excite the passions of men for the destruction of one another. Nor is this all. The very colors of the armies are consecrated. I do not mean to say, that, like the banners in the prætorian tents, they are actually worshipped, but that an attempt is made to render them holy in the eyes of those, who are present. An attempt is made, wonderful to relate, to incorporate war into the religion of Jesus Christ, and to perpetuate enmity on the foundation of his Gospel!

Now this is the policy of the world; and can it be seriously imagined that such a system as this can ever lead to peace? For while discussions relative to matters of national dispute are carried on in a high tone, because a more humble tone would betray weakness or fear;—while, again, during the discussion, preparations for war are going on, because the appearance of being prepared would give the idea of determined resolution and of more than ordinary strength;—while, again, during the same discussion, the national spirit is awakened and inflamed;—and while, again, when hostilities have commenced, measures are resorted to, to perpetuate a national enmity, so that the parties consider themselves as natural enemies even in the succeeding peace—what hope is there of the extermination of war on earth?

But let us now look at the opposite policy, which is that of the Gospel. Now this policy would consist in the practice of meekness, moderation, love, patience, and forbearance, with a strict regard to justice, so that no advantages might be taken on either side. But if these principles, all of which are preventive of irritation, were to be dis-

played in our negotiations abroad in the case of any matter in dispute,—would they not annihilate the necessity of wars? For what is the natural tendency of such principles? What is their tendency, for instance, in private life? And who are the negotiators on these occasions, but men? Which kind of conduct is more likely to disarm an opponent,—that of him, who holds up his arm to strike, if his opponent should not comply with his terms; or of him, who argues justly, who manifests a temper of love and forbearance, and who professes that he will rather suffer than resist, and that he will do everything sooner than that the affair shall not be amicably settled? The apostle Paul, who knew well the human heart, says, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head;" that is, thou shalt cause him by thy amiable conduct to experience burning feelings within himself, which, while they torment him with the wickedness of his own conduct, shall make him esteem thee, and bring him over to thy side. Thus thou shalt overcome his evil by thy good: or, in other words, as fire melts the hardest metals, so thy kindness shall melt his anger. Thus Parnell:

> "So artists melt the sullen ore of lead,
> By heaping coals of fire upon its head.
> Touched by the warmth, the metal learns to glow.
> And pure from dross the silver runs below."

This policy, again, would consist of the practical duty of attempting to tranquilize the minds of the people while the discussion was going on; of exhorting them to await the event with composure; of declaring against the folly and wickedness of wars, as if peace only could be the result; of abstaining from all hostile preparations, and indeed from all appearance of violence. Now what influence would such a conduct have, again, but particularly when known to the opposite party. If the opposite party were to see those alluded to keeping down the passions of their people, would they inflame the passions of their own? If they were to be convinced that these were making no preparations for war, would they put themselves to the expense of arming? Can we see any other termination of such a contest than the continuance of peace?

That the policy of the Gospel, if acted upon by statesmen, would render wars unnecessary, we may infer from supposed cases. And, first, I would ask this simple question:—whether, if all the world were Quakers, there would be any more wars? I am sure the reply would be, No. But why not? Because nations, consisting of such individuals, it would be replied, would discuss matters in dispute between them with moderation, with temper, and with forbearance.

They would never make any threats. They would never arm; and consequently they would never fight. It would be owing, then, to these principles, or, in other words, to the adoption of the policy of the Gospel in preference of the policy of the world, that if the globe were to be peopled by this Society there would be no wars. Now I would ask, what are Quakers but men; and might not all, if they would suffer themselves to be cast in the same mould as the Quakers, come out of it of the same form and character.

But I will go still further. I will suppose that any one of the four quarters of the world, having been previously divided into three parts, was governed only by three Quakers, and that these had the same authority over their subjects as their respective sovereigns have at present: and I will maintain that there would never be upon this quarter of the world, during their respective administrations, another war. For, first, many of the causes of war would be cut off. Thus, for instance, there would be no disputes about insults offered to flags. There would be none, again, about the balance of power. In short, it would be laid down as a position, that no one was to do evil that good might come. But as, notwithstanding, there might still be disputes from other causes, these would be amicably settled. For, first, the same Christian disposition would be manifested in the discussion as in the former case. And, secondly, if the matter should be of an intricate nature, so that one Quaker-government could not settle it with another, these would refer it, according to their constitution, to a third. This would be the "ne plus ultra" of the business. Both the discussion and the dispute would end here. What a folly, then, to talk of the necessity of wars, when, if but three members of this Society were to rule a continent, they would cease there! There can be no plea for such language, but the impossibility of taming the human passions. But the subjugation of these is the immediate object of our religion. To confess, therefore, that wars must be, is either to utter a libel against Christianity, or to confess that we have not yet arrived at the stature of real Christians.

SECTION VII.

Subject further examined—Case allowed that, if a Cabinet of good men had to negotiate with a Cabinet of good men, there might be no wars—but what would be the issue, if good had to deal with bad—Case of American settlers, who adopted the policy of the world, and were always at war—and of other American settlers, who adopted the policy of the Gospel, and were always at peace—no case stronger than where civilized men had to deal with savage American tribes.

I BELIEVE it will be allowed, that the Quaker-instances mentioned

in the last section are in point. I am aware, however, it will be said, that though different Cabinets all having the same Christian disposition would settle their disputes in a friendly manner, how would a Cabinet consisting of spiritually-minded men settle with a Cabinet of other men, who had not brought their passions under due regulation, and who, besides, had no notion of the unlawfulness of war?

I apprehend it will not be denied, that men as ferocious as any recorded in history were those, who were found in America when that continent was discovered. We hear nothing of Africans, or of Asiatics, which would induce us to suppose that they were more wild and barbarous than these; and nothing is more true of these, than that they were frequently concerned in wars. I shall therefore take these for an example; and I shall show by the opposite conduct of two different communities towards them, that it rests with men to live peaceably or not, as they cultivate the disposition to do it, or as they follow the policy of the Gospel in preference of the policy of the world.

When the English, Dutch, and others, began to people America, they purchased land of the natives. But when they went to that continent, notwithstanding there were amiable persons among them, and friends to civil and religious liberty, they went with the notions of worldly policy, and they did not take with them the Christian wisdom of the unlawfulness of war. They acted on the system of preparation, because there might be danger. They never settled without palisados and a fort. They kept their nightly watches, though unmolested. They were, in short, in the midst of war, though no injury had been offered them by the natives, and though professedly in a state of peace.

In the peopling of Connecticut, for I must begin with some one State, it was ordered at an English Court, "holden at Dorchester on the seventh day of June, 1636, that every town should keep a watch, and be well supplied with ammunition. The constables were directed to warn the watches in their turns, and to make it their care that they should be kept according to the direction of the court. They were required also to take care that the inhabitants were well furnished with arms and ammunition, and kept in a constant state of defence*." As these infant settlements, the author observes, "were filled and surrounded with numerous savages, the people conceived themselves in danger when they lay down, and when they rose up, and when they went out, and when they came in. Their circum-

* Trumbull's History of Connecticut, p. 56.

stances was such, that it was judged necessary for every man to be a soldier."

I find from this author, looking further into his History, that previously to the order of the Court of Dorchester, which did nothing more than enjoin a more strict execution of the original plan, which was that of military preparation and defence, some of the settlers had been killed by the natives. The provocation, which the natives received, is not mentioned. But it was probably provocation enough to savage Indians to see people settle in their country with all the signs and symptoms of war. Was such a system likely to have any other effect than that of exciting their jealousy? They could see that these settlers had at least no objection to the use of arms. They could see that these arms could never be intended but against other persons, and there were no other persons there but themselves. Judging, therefore, by outward circumstances, they could draw no inference of a peaceable disposition in their new neighbors. War soon followed. The Pequots were attacked. Prisoners were made on both sides. The Pequots treated those settlers barbarously, who fell into their hands, for they did not see on the capture of their own countrymen any better usage on the part of the settlers themselves; for these settlers, again, had not the wisdom to use the policy of the Gospel, but preferred the policy of the world. "Though the first planters of New England and Connecticut," says the same author, "were men of eminent piety and strict morals, yet, like other good men, they were subject to misconception and the influence of passion. Their beheading Sachems, whom they took in war, killing the male captives, and enslaving the women and children was treating them with a severity, which on the benevolent principles of Christianity it will be difficult to justify*."

After this treatment war followed war. And as other settlements were made in other States on the same principles, war fell to their portion likewise. And the whole history of the settlement of America, where these principles were followed, or where the policy of the world was adopted, is full of the wars between the settlers and the Indians, which have continued more or less, nearly up to the present day.

But widely different was the situation of the settlers under William Penn. When he and his Fellow-Quakers went to this continent, they went with principles of Christian wisdom, or they adopted the policy of the Gospel instead of the policy of the world. They had to deal with the same savage Indians as the other settlers.

---

* See Trumbull's History of Connecticut, p. 112.

They had the same fury to guard against, and were in a situation much more exposed to attack, and of course much more creative of alarm; for they had neither sword, nor musket, nor palisado, nor fort. They judged it neither necessary to watch, nor to be provided with ammunition, nor to become soldiers. They spoke the language of peace to the natives, and they proved the sincerity of their language by their continuance in a defenceless condition. They held out, also, that all wars were unlawful, and that whatever injuries were offered them, they would sooner bear them than gratify the principle of revenge. It is quite needless to go further into the system of this venerable founder of Pennsylvania. But it may be observed, that no Quaker settlers, when known to be such, were killed*. And whatever attacks were made upon the possessors of lands in their neighborhood, none were ever made upon those, who settled on the lands purchased by William Penn.

It may not be improper to observe, further, that the harmonious intercourse between the Indians and the Quakers continues uninterrupted to the present day. In matters of great and public concern, of which I could mention instances, it has been usual with the Indians to send deputies to them for their advice. And the former have even been prevailed upon by the latter to relinquish wars, which they had it in contemplation to undertake. It is usual also for some of these to send their children to the Society for education. And so great is the influence of the Quakers over some of these tribes, that many individuals belonging to them, and now living together, have been reclaimed from a savage life. These have laid aside the toilsome occupations of the chase. They raise horses, cattle, and sheep. They cultivate wheat and flax. They weave and spin. They have houses, barns, and saw-mills among them, They have schools also; and civilization is taking place of the grossest barbarism.†

* "The Indians shot him who had the gun," says Story in his Journal; "and when they knew the young man they killed was a Quaker, they seemed very sorry for it, but blamed him for carrying a gun. For they knew the Quakers would not fight, or do them any harm, and therefore by carrying a gun they took him for an enemy." This instance, which was in after times, confirms still more strongly all that has been said on this subject. Quakers at this time occasionally armed themselves against the wild beasts of the country.

† I refer the reader to an Account, lately published by Phillips and Fardon, George-yard, Lombard-street, of the Proceedings of two Committees, the one appointed by the Yearly Meeting of Friends of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, &c., and the other by the Yearly Meeting held at Baltimore, for the promoting the Civilization of the Indian Natives. He will see in this Account the judicious, disinterested, and truly Christian manner, in which the Quakers have conducted themselves for the attainment of this great object.

These facts, when contrasted, speak for themselves. A Cabinet of Quaker-ministers, acting upon the policy of the Gospel, has been seated in the heart of a savage and warlike nation, and peace has been kept with them for ever. A Cabinet of other settlers, acting on the policy of the world, has been seated in the heart of nations of a similar description, and they have almost always been embroiled in wars, If Christian policy has had its influence on Barbarians, it would be libellous to say that it would not have its influence upon those, who profess to be Christians. Let us then, again, from the instances which have been now recited, deprecate the necessity of wars. Let us not think so meanly of the Christian religion as that it does not forbid, nor so meanly of its power as that it is not able to prevent, their continuance. Let us not think, to the disgrace of our religion, that the human heart under its influence should be so retrogade, that the expected blessing of universal peace should be thought no improvement in our moral condition, or that our feelings under its influence should continue so impure, that when it arrives we should regard it not so much a blessing as a curse. But let us, on the other hand, hope and believe, that as an opposite and purer policy is acted upon, it will do good to our own natures, good to the peace and happiness of the world, and honor to the religion of the Gospel.

SECTION VIII.

Subject finally considered—Authors of wars generally justify their own as defensive—and state, that if any nation were to give up the practice of war, or to act on the policy of the Gospel, it would be overrun by others which acted upon the policy of the world—reason to believe that such a nation would be held in veneration by others, and applied to by them for the settlement of their disputes—Sentiments of bishop Butler in a supposed case—Case of Antoninus Pius—Conclusion.

Having now said all that I intended to say on the supposed necessity of wars, I shall for a short time direct the attention of the reader to two points,—the only two that I purpose to notice on this subject.

It is usually said, first, that the different Powers, who go to war, give it out that their wars are defensive, or that they justify themselves on this principle.

I shall observe in reply to this, that it is frequently difficult to determine where actual aggression begins. Even old aggressions of long standing have their bearings in these disputes. Nor shall we find often any clue to a solution of the difficulty in the manifestoes of either party; for each makes his case good in these; and if we were to decide upon the merits of the question by the contents of

these, we should often come to a conclusion, that both the parties were wrong. Thus, for instance, a nation may have been guilty of an offence to another. So far the cause of the other is a just one. But if the other should arm first, and this during an attempt at accommodation, it will be a question whether it does not forfeit its pretensions to a just case, and whether both are not then to be considered as aggressors on the occasion.

When a nation avows its objects in a war, and changes its object in the course of it, the presumption is that such a nation has been the aggressor. And when any nation goes to war upon no other avowed principle than that of the balance of power, such a nation, however right according to the policy of the world, is an aggressor according to the policy of the Gospel, because it proceeds upon the the principle that it is lawful to do evil that good may come.

If a nation hires or employs the troops of another to fight for it, though it is not the aggressor in any war, yet it has the crime upon its head of making those aggressors, whom it employs. There are few modern wars, however, which can be called defensive. A war purely defensive is that, in which the inhabitants of a nation remain wholly at home to repel the attacks of another, and content themselves with sending protection to those settlements, which belong to it. But few instances are recorded of such wars.

But if there be often a difficulty in discerning between aggressive and defensive wars; and if, moreover, there is reason to suppose that most of the modern wars are aggressive, or that both parties become aggressors in the course of the dispute; it becomes the rulers of nations to pause, and to examine their own consciences with fear and trembling, before they allow the sword to be drawn, lest a dreadful responsibility should fall upon their heads for all the destruction of happiness, all the havoc of life, and all the slaughter of morals, that may ensue.

It is said, secondly, that if any nation were publicly to determine to relinquish the practice of war, or to act on the policy of the Gospel, it would be overrun by other nations, which might act on the policy of the world.

This argument is neither more nor less than that of the Pagan Celsus, who said in the second century, that if the rest of the Roman empire were Christians, it would be overrun by the Barbarians.

In answering this argument we are certainly warranted in saying, that such a nation would have just reason to look up to the Almighty for his support. Would he not ultimately protect those, who obeyed his laws, and who refused to destroy their fellow-creatures? In

what page of sacred history do we find that the people are to be forsaken, who have acted righteously?

But independently of the protection, which such a nation might count upon from the Moral Governor of the world, let us inquire upon rational principles what would be likely to be its fate.

Armies, we know, are kept up by one nation, principally because they are kept up by another. And in proproportion as one rival-nation adds to its standing armies, it is thought by the other to be consistent with the policy of the world to do the same. But if one nation were to decline keeping any armies at all, where would be the violence to reason to suppose, that the other would follow the example? Who would not be glad to get rid of the expense of keeping them, if they could do it with safety? Nor is it likely that any powerful nation professing to relinquish war would experience the calamities of it. Its care to avoid provocation would be so great, and its language would be so temperate, and reasonable, and just, and conciliatory, in the case of any dispute which might arise, that it could hardly fail of obtaining an accommodation. And the probability is, that such a nation would grow so high in esteem with other nations, that they would have recourse to it in their disputes with one another, and would abide by its decision. "Add the general influence," says the great Bishop Butler in his Analogy, "which such a kingdom would have over the face of the earth, by way of example particularly, and the reverence which would be paid to it. It would, plainly, be superior to all others, and the world must gradually come under its empire; not by means of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be just conquest, and partly by other kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it throughout a course of ages, and claiming its protection one after another, in successive exigencies. The head of it would be an universal Monarch in another sense than any other mortal has yet been, and the Eastern style would be literally applicable to him, "that all people, nations, and languages should serve him." Now Bishop Butler supposes this would be the effect, where the individuals of a nation were perfectly virtuous. But I ask much less for my own hypothesis. I only ask that the ruling members of the Cabinet of any great nation (and perhaps these would only amount to three or four) should consist of real Christians, or of such men as would implicitly follow the policy of the Gospel; and I believe the result would be as I have described it.

Nor indeed are we without instances of the kind. The goodness of the emperor Antoninus Pius was so great, that he was said to have outdone all example. He had no war in the course of a long

reign of twenty-four years, so that he was compared to Numa. And nothing is more true, than that princes referred their controversies to his decision.

Nor must I forget to bring again to the notice of the reader the instance, though on a smaller scale, of the colonists and descendants of William Penn. The Quakers have uniformly conducted themselves towards the Indians in such a manner, as to give them from their earliest intercourse an exalted idea of their character. And the consequence is, as I stated in a prior section, that the former in affairs of importance are consulted by the latter at the present day. But why, if the Cabinet of any one powerful nation were to act upon the noble principle of relinquishing war, should we think the other Cabinets so lost to good feelings as not to respect its virtue? Let us instantly abandon this thought; for the supposition of a contrary sentiment would make them worse than the savages I have mentioned.

Let us then cherish the fond hope that human animosities are not to be eternal, and that man is not always to be made a tiger to man. Let us hope that the Government of some one nation (and when we consider the vast power of the British empire, the nature of its constitution and religion, and the general humanity of its inhabitants, none would be better qualified than our own) will set the example of the total dereliction of wars. And let us, in all our respective situations, precede the anticipated blessing, by holding out the necessity of the subjugation of the passions, and by inculcating the doctrine of universal benevolence to man;—so that, when we look upon the beautiful islands, which lie scattered as so many ornaments of the ocean, we may wish their several inhabitants no greater injury than the violence of their own waves; or that, when we view continents at a distance from us, we may consider them as inhabited by our brothers; or that, when we contemplate the ocean itself, which may separate them from our sight, we may consider it not as separating our love, but as intended by Providence to be the means of a quicker intercourse for the exchange of reciprocal blessings.

CHAPTER IV.

SECTION I.

Fourth tenet is on the subject of a Pecuniary Maintenance of a Gospel-Ministry—Example and precepts of Jesus Christ—also of Paul and Peter—conclusions from these premises—these conclusions supported by the primitive practice—great tenet resulting from these conclusions and this primitive practice is, that the Quakers hold it unlawful to pay their own ministers, and also others of any other denomination, for their Gospel-labors.

The fourth and last tenet of the Society is on the subject of the Unlawfulness of a Pecuniary Maintenance of a Gospel-Ministry.

In explaining this tenet I am aware that I am treading upon delicate ground. The great majority of Christians have determined that the spiritual laborer is worthy of his hire; that if men relinquish the usual occupations, by which a livelihood is obtained, in order that they may devote themselves to the service of religion, they are entitled to a pecuniary maintenance; and that if they produce a rich harvest from what they sow, they are of all men, considering their usefulness to man to be greater in this than in any other service they can render him, the most worthy of encouragement and support. I am aware also of the possibility of giving offence to some, in the course of the explanation of this tenet. To these I can only say, that I have no intention of hurting the feelings of any; that in the Church there are those, whom I esteem and love, and whom of all others I should be sorry to offend. But it must be obvious to these, and indeed to all, that it is impossible for me, in writing a history of the manners and opinions of the Society, to pass over in silence the tenet that is now before me; and if I notice it, they must be sensible that it becomes me to state fully and fairly all the arguments, which the Quakers give for the difference of opinion, which they manifest from the rest of their fellow-citizens on this subject.

It does not appear, then, the Quakers say, by any records that can be produced, that Jesus Christ ever received any payment for the doctrines, which he taught; neither does it appear, as far as his own instructions, which are recorded by the Evangelists, can be collected on this subject, that he considered any pecuniary stipend as necessary or proper for those, who were to assist in the promotion of his religion.

Jesus Christ, on the erection of his Gospel-ministry, gave rules to his Disciples how they were to conduct themselves in the case before us. He enjoined the twelve, before he sent them on this errand, as we collect from St. Matthew and St. Luke, that, "as they had re-

ceived freely, so they were to give freely; that they were to provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in their purses, nor scrip nor other things for their journey, for that the workman was worthy of his meat*." And on their return from their mission he asked them, "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing. Then said he unto them, But now he that hath a purse let him take it, and likewise his scrip†."

In a little time afterwards Jesus Christ sent out other seventy of his Disciples, to whom he gave instructions similar to the former, that they should not take scrip, or clothes, or money, with them. But to these he said additionally, that "wheresoever they were received they were to eat such things as were given them; but where they were not received they were to go their way, and say, Even the dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you‡." And as on that occasion he compared the ministers of the Gospel to the laborers, whom a man sends to the harvest, he told them they were at liberty to eat what was set before them, because the laborer was worthy of his hire.

This the Quakers conceive to be the substance of all that Jesus Christ taught upon this subject. They go therefore, next, to St. Paul for a further elucidation of it.

They are of opinion that St. Paul, in his Epistles to Timothy, and to the Corinthians and Galatians,§ acknowledges the position, that the spiritual laborer is worthy of his hire.

The same apostle, however, says, that "if any would not work, neither should he eat‖." From this text they draw two conclusions: first, that when ministers of the Gospel are idle, they are not entitled to bodily sustenance; and, secondly, that those only, who receive them, are expected to support them. The same apostle says, also, "Let him that is taught in the Word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things¶;" but he no where says, "to him that teacheth not."

But though men, who faithfully spend their time in preaching the Gospel, are entitled to bodily maintenance from those, who receive them, yet St. Paul, the Quakers say, as far as his own practice was concerned, thought it more consistent with the spirit of Christianity, and less detrimental to its interests, to support himself by the labor of his own hands, than to be supported by that of others. And he advises others to do the same, and not to make their preaching

---

* Matt. x. 8. Luke ix. † Luke xxii. 35. ‡ Luke x.

§ 1 Cor. ix.—1 Tim. v.—Gal. vi. ‖ 2 Thess. iii. 10. ¶ Gal. vi. 6

chargeable, "not because," says he, "we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample to you to follow us*."

This power the Quakers consider ministers of the Gospel to abuse, who make their preaching chargeable, if by any means they can support themselves; for St. Paul says, further, "What is my reward, then? Verily, that when I preach the Gospel I may make the Gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the Gospel†." Thus the apostle, they conceive, looks up to God, and not to men, for the reward of his spiritual labors. And the same apostle makes it a characteristic of the false teachers, that they make a merchandize of their hearers‡.

It is objected to the Society on this occasion, that St. Paul received relief from the brethren of Philippi as well as from others, when he did not preach. But their reply is, that this relief consisted of voluntary and affectionate presents sent to him, when in circumstances of distress. In this case the apostle states that he never desired these gifts, but that it was pleasant to him to see his religious instruction produce a benevolence of disposition, that would abound to their own account§.

St. Peter is the only other person who is mentioned in the New Testament, as speaking on this subject. Writing to those, who had been called to the spiritual oversight of the churches, he advises as follows: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock; and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away‖." Upon these words the members of this Society make three observations:—that ministers should not make a gain of the Gospel;—that they should look to God for their reward, and not to men;—and that St. Peter himself must have preached, like St. Paul, without fee or reward, or he could not consistently have recommended such a practice to others.

They come, therefore, from the example and precepts of Jesus Christ, and of the apostles Paul and Peter, to the following conclusions on this subject: First, that God raises up his own ministers. Secondly, that these are to dispense his Gospel freely. Thirdly, that they are to take, wherever they are received, such things as are given them, (which things they deserve while in the exercise of their calling as much as the laborer his hire) but that no bargains are to be

---

*2 Thess. iii. 9, †1 Cor. ix. 18. ‡2 Peter ii. 3.
§ Philipp. iv. 17, ‖ 1 Peter v. 2.

made about religion; that they are not to compel men to give, neither are they to take away any thing from those, who are unwilling to receive them; but, in this case, to go their ways, and shake the dust from their feet against them; or, in other words, to declare that they have done their own duty in going to them with the word of God, and that the fault lies with them in refusing to hear it. Neither when they return from their missions, or are idle at home, are they to receive any thing, but to use their own scrips, and purses, and clothes. And, fourthly, that though it be lawful for them to receive such sustenance, under such limitations, during the exercise of their ministry, it would be more consistent with the spirit of Christianity, if they would give their spiritual labors freely, and look up to God for their reward;—thus avoiding the character of false teachers, and the imputation of an abuse of their power in the Gospel.

Now these conclusions, the Quakers say, seem to have been sanctioned in a great measure by the primitive practice for the three first centuries of the Church, or till the darkness of Apostasy began to overwhelm the religious world.

In the very early times of the Gospel, many Christians, both at Jerusalem and Alexandria in Egypt, sold their possessions and lived together on the produce of their common stock. Others, in Antioch, Galatia, and Pontus, retained their estates in their possession, but established a fund, consisting of weekly or monthly offerings, for the support of the Church. This fund continued in after times: but it was principally for the relief of poor and distressed Saints, in which the ministers of the Gospel, if in that situation, might also share. Tertullian, in speaking of such funds, gives the following account: "Whatsoever we have," says he, "in the treasury of our churches, is not raised by taxation, as though we put men to ransom their religion, but every man once a month, or when it pleaseth him, bestoweth what he thinks proper, but not except he be willing. For no man is compelled, but left free to his own discretion. And that, which is thus given, is not bestowed in vanity, but in relieving the poor, and upon children destitute of parents, and in the maintenance of aged and feeble persons, and of men wrecked by sea, and of such as have been condemned to metalic mines, or have been banished to islands, or have been cast into prison professing the Christian faith."

In process of time, towards the close of the third century, some lands began to be given to the Church. The revenue from these was thrown into the general treasury or fund, and was distributed, as other offerings were, by the deacons and elders; but neither bishops nor ministers of the Gospel were allowed to have any concern with

it. It appears from Origen, Cyprian, Urban, Prosper, and others, that if in those times such ministers were able to support themselves, they were to have nothing from this fund. The fund was not for the benefit of any particular person. But if such ministers stood in need of sustenance, they might receive from it; but they were to be satisfied with simple diet, and necessary apparel. And so sacred was this fund held to the purposes of its institution, that the first Christian emperors, who did as the bishops advised them, had no recourse to it, but supplied the wants of ministers of the Gospel from their own revenues, as Eusebius, Theodoret, and Sozomen relate.

The Council of Antioch, in the year 340, finding fault with the deacons relative to the management of the funds of the churches, ordained that the bishops might distribute them, but that they should take no part of them to themselves, or for the use of the priests and brethren, who lived with them, unless necessity required it; using the words of the apostle, "Having food and raiment, be therewith content."

In looking at other instances, cited by the Quakers, I shall mention one, which throws light for a few years further upon this subject. In the year 359, Constantius, the Emperor, having summoned a general council of bishops to Ariminum in Italy, and provided for their subsistence there, the British and French bishops, judging it not decent to live on the public, chose rather to live at their own expense. Three only out of Britain, compelled by want, but yet refusing assistance offered to them by the rest, accepted the emperor's provision, judging it more proper to subsist by public than by private support. This delicate conduct of the bishops is brought to show, that where ministers of the Gospel had the power of maintaining themselves, they had no notion of looking up to the public. In short, in those early times, ministers were maintained only where their necessities required it, and this out of the fund of the poor. They, who took from this fund, had the particular appellation given them of "Sportularii," or "Basket-clerks," because, according to Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others, they had their portion of sustenance given them in baskets. These portions consisted but of a small pittance, sufficient only for their livelihood, and were given them on the principle laid down by St. Matthew, that the ministers of Jesus Christ were to eat and drink only such things as were set before them.

In process of time new doctrines were advanced relative to the maintenance of the ministry, which will be hereafter explained. But as these were the inventions of men, and introduced during the Apostacy, the members of this Society see no reason why should

look up to these in preference to those of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, and of the practice of Christians in the purest ages of the Church. They believe, on the other hand, that the latter only are to be relied upon as the true doctrines. These were founded in divine wisdom on the erection of the Gospel-ministry, and were unmixed with the inventions of men. They were founded on the genius and spirit of Christianity, and not on the genius or spirit of the world. The Quakers, therefore, looking up to these as to the surer foundation, have adopted the following tenets on this subject:

They believe, first, that it would be inconsistent in them as Christians to make a pecuniary payment to their own ministers for their Gospel-labors. And they regulate their practice accordingly upon this principle. No one is ever paid by them for the performance of any office in the Church. If a minister lives at home and attends the meeting to which he belongs, he supports himself, as St. Paul did, by his own trade. If he goes on the ministry to other meetings, he is received by the members of the Society as he travels along, and he finds meat and drink at the houses of these. His travelling expenses also are generally defrayed in this particular case. But he receives no reward, or fixed or permanent stipend, for his services on these or on any other such occasions.

And as the Quakers cannot pay their own ministers, so it is a tenet with them that they cannot pay those of other denominations for their Gospel-labors, upon the same principles; that is, they believe that all ministers of every description ought to follow the example, which St. Paul gave and enjoined them, of maintaining themselves by their own hands; they ought look up to God, and not to men, for their reward; they ought to avoid the character of false teachers, and the imputation of abusing their power in the Gospel. And to these they add a particular reason drawn from the texts quoted, which is not applicable in the former case; namely, that ministers are not authorized to take meat and drink from those, who are not willing to receive them.

SECTION II.

Other reasons why Quakers cannot pay ministers of the Gospel of other denominations from themselves—these arise out of the nature of the payments made to them, or out of the nature of tithes—history of tithes from the fourth century to the reign of Henry the Eighth, when they were definitely consolieated into the laws of the land.

But the members of this Society have other reasons, besides the general reasons and the particular one which have been given, why, as Christians, they cannot pay ministers of a different denomination from themselves for their Gospel-labors, or why they cannot pay

ministers of the Established Church. These arise out of the nature of the payments, which are made to them, or out of the nature of tithes. But to see these in their proper light, some notion should be given of the origin of this mode of their maintenance. I shall therefore give a very concise history of tithes from the fourth century, to which period I have already brought the reader, to the reign of Henry the Eighth, when they took a station in the laws of the land, from which they have yet never been displaced.

It has already appeared, that between the middle and the close of the fourth century, such ministers of the Gospel, as were able, supported themselves, but that those who were not able, were supported out of the fund for the poor. The latter, however, had no fixed or determined proportion of this fund allotted them, but had only a bare livelihood from it, consisting of victuals served out to them in baskets, as before explained. This fund, too, consisted of voluntary offerings, or of revenues from land voluntary bequeathed. And the principle on which these gifts or voluntary offerings were made, was the duty of charity to the poor. One material innovation, however, had been introduced, as I remarked before, since its institution; namely, that the bishops, and not the deacons had now the management of this fund.

At the latter end of the fourth century, and from this period to the eighth, other changes took place in the system, of which I have been speaking. Ministers of the Gospel began to be supported, all of them without distinction, from the funds of the poor. This circumstance occasioned a greater number of persons to be provided for than before. The people therefore were solicited for greater contributions than had been ordinarily given. Jerom and Chrysostom, out of good and pious motives, exhorted them in turn to give bountifully to the poor, and double honor to those, who labored in the Lord's work, and though they left the people at liberty to bestow what they pleased, they gave it as their opinion that they ought not to be less liberal than the ancient Jews, who under the Levitical law gave a tenth of their property to the priesthood and to the poor. Ambrose, in like manner, recommended tenths as now necessary, and as only a suitable donation, for these purposes.

The same line of conduct continued to be pursued by those, who succeeded in the government of the Church, by Augustine, bishop of Hippo, by Pope Leo, by Gregory, by Severin among the Christians in Pannonia, and by others. Their exhortations, however, on this subject were now mixed with promises and threats. Pardon of sins, and future rewards, were held out on the one hand; and it was suggested on the other, that the people themselves would be reduced to

a tenth, and the blood of all the poor, who died, would be upon their heads, if they gave less than a tenth of their income to holy uses. By exhortations of this sort, reiterated for three centuries, it began at length to be expected of the people that they would not give less than tenths of what they possessed. No right, however, was alleged to such a proportion of their income, nor was coercion ever spoken of. These tenths also were for holy uses, which chiefly included the benefit of the poor. They were called the Lord's goods in consequence, and were also denominated the Patrimony of the Poor.

Another change took place within the period assigned, which I must now mention as of great concern. Ministers of the Gospel now living wholly out of the tenths which with legacies constituted the fund of the poor, a determined portion of this fund, contrary to all former usage, was set apart for their use. Of this fund one-fourth was generally given to the poor, one-fourth to the repairs of churches, one-fourth to officiating ministers, and one-fourth to the bishops*, with whom they lived. Hence the maintenance of the ministry, as consisting of these two orders, and the repairs of churches, took now the greatest part of it; so that the face of things began to be materially altered. For whereas formerly this fund went chiefly to the poor, out of which ministers of the Gospel were provided, it now went chiefly to the church, out of which there came a provision for the poor. Another change must be noticed with respect to the principle, on which the gifts towards this fund were offered. For whereas tenths were formerly solicited on the Christian duty of charity to the poor, they were now solicited on the principle that by the law of Moses they ought to be given for holy uses, in which the benefit of the fatherless, the stranger, and the widow was included. From this time I shall use the word Tithes for tenths, and the word Clergy instead of ministers of the Gospel.

In the eighth century matters were as I have now represented them The people had been brought into a notion that they were to give no less than a tenth of their income to holy uses. Bishops generally at this time, and indeed long previously to this, lived in monasteries. Their clergy lived also with them in these monasteries, and went from thence to preach in the country within the diocese. It must be also noticed, that there were at this time other monasteries under abbots or priors, consisting mostly of lay-persons, and distinct from those mentioned, and supported by offerings and legacies in the same manner. The latter, however, not having numerous ecclesiastics to

* In process of time, as the bishops became otherwise provided for, the fund was divided into three parts, for the other three purposes just mentioned.

support, laid out more of their funds than the former were enabled to do, towards the entertainment of strangers, and towards the maintenance of the poor. Now it must be observed, that when these two different kinds of monasteries existed, the people were at liberty to pay their tithes to either of them as they pleased; and that, having this permission, they generally favored the latter. To these they not only paid their tithes, but gave their donations by legacy. This preference of the lay-abbeys to the ecclesiastical arose from a knowledge that the poor, for whose benefit tithes had been originally preached up, would be more materially served. Other circumstances, too, occurred, which induced the people to continue the same preference. For the bishops in many places began to abuse their trust, as the deacons had done before, by attaching the bequeathed lands to their sees,—so that the inferior clergy and the poor became in a manner dependent upon them for their daily bread. In other places the clergy had seized all to their own use. The people, therefore, so thoroughly favored the lay-abbeys in preference to those of the Church, that the former became daily richer, while the latter did little more than maintain their ground.

This preference, however, which made such a difference in the funds of the ecclesiastical and of the lay-monasteries, was viewed with a jealous eye by the clergy of those times, and measures were at length taken to remove it. In a council under Pope Alexander the Third, in the year 1180, it was determined that the liberty of the people should be restrained with respect to their tithes. They were accordingly forbidden to make appropriations to religious houses without the consent of the bishop, in whose diocese they lived. But even this prohibition did not succeed. The people still favored the lay-abbeys, paying their tithes there till Pope Innocent the Third, in the year 1200, ordained, and he enforced it by ecclesiastical censures, that every one should pay his tithes to those, who administered to him spiritual things in his own parish. In a general council, also, held at Lyons in the year 1274, it was decreed, that it was no longer lawful for men to pay their tithes where they pleased, as before, but that they should pay them to Mother-Church. And the principle, on which they had now been long demanded, was confirmed by the Council of Trent under Pope Pius the Fourth, in the year 1560, which was, that they were due by divine right. In the course of forty years after the payment of tithes had been enforced by ecclesiastical censures and excommunications, prescription was set up. Thus the very principle, in which tithes had originated, was changed. Thus free-will offerings became dues to be exacted by compulsion. And thus the fund of the poor was converted almost wholly into a fund for the maintenance of the Church.

Having now traced the origin of tithes, as far as a part of the continent of Europe is concerned, I shall trace it as far as they have reference to our own country, And here I may observe in few words, that the same system and the same changes are conspicuous. Free-will offerings and donations of land constituted a fund for the poor, out of which the clergy were maintained. In process of time tenths or tithes followed. Of these certain proportions were allowed to the clergy, the repairs of the churches, and the poor. This was the state of things in the time of Offa king of Mercia, towards the close of the eighth century, when that prince, having caused Ethelbert king of the East Angles to be treacherously murdered, fled to the Pope for pardon; to please whom and to expiate his own sin, he caused those tithes to become dues in his own dominions, which were only at the will of the donors before.

About sixty years afterwards, Ethelwolf, a weak and superstitious prince, was worked upon by the clergy to extend tithes as dues to the whole kingdom; and he consented to it under the notion that he was thus to avert the judgments of God, which they represented as visible in the frequent ravages of the Danes. Poor lay-men, however, were still to be supported out of these tithes, and the people were still at liberty to pay them to whichever religious persons they pleased.

About the close of the tenth century Edgar took from the people the right of disposing of their tithes at their own discretion, and directed that they should be paid to the parish-churches. But the other monasteries or lay-houses resisting, his orders became useless for a time. At this period the lay-monasteries were rich, but the parochial clergy poor. Pope Innocent, however, by sending out his famous decree before mentioned to king John, which was to be observed in England as well as in other places under his jurisdiction, and by which it was enacted that every man was to pay his tithes to those only, who administered spiritual help to him in his own parish, settled the affair; for he set up ecclesiastical courts, thundered out his interdicts, and frightened both king and people*.

* To show the principles, upon which princes acted with respect to tithes in these times, the following translation of a preamble to an Act of king Stephen may be produced: "Because through the providence of Divine mercy we know it to be so ordered, and by the Churches publishing it far and near every body has heard, that by the distribution of alms persons may be absolved from the bonds of sin, and acquire the rewards of heavenly joys: I, Stephen, by the grace of God, king of England, being willing to have a share with those, who by a happy kind of commerce exchange heavenly things for earthly, and smitten with the love of God, and for the salvation of my own soul, and the souls of my father and mother, and all my forefathers and ancestors," &c.

Richard the Second confirmed these tithes to the parishes as thus settled by this Pope; but it was directed by an act, that, in all appropriations of churches, the bishops of the diocese should ordain a convenient sum of money to be distributed out of the fruits and profits of every living among the poor parishioners annually in aid of their living and sustenance. "Thus, it seems," says Judge Blackstone, "the people were frequently sufferers by the withholding those alms, for which among other purposes the payment of tithes was originally imposed." At length tithes were finally confirmed, and in a more explicit manner, by the famous act of Henry the Eighth on this subject. And here I must just observe, that whereas from the eighth century to this reign tithes were said to be due, whenever the reason of them was expressed, by divine right as under the Levitical law,—so in the preamble to the act of Henry the Eighth they are founded on the same principle, being described therein "as due to God and holy Church." Thus, on the continent of Europe as well as in our own country, were these changes brought about which have been described: and they were brought about also by the same means; for they were made partly by the exhortations and sermons of Monks, partly by the decrees of Popes, partly by the edict of Popish Kings, and partly by the determination, of Popish Councils.

It is not necessary that I should trace this subject further, or that I should make distinctions relative to tithes, whether they may be rectorial, or vicarial, or whether they may belong to lay-persons. I have already developed enough of their history for my purpose. I shall therefore hasten to state those other reasons, which the Quakers have to give, why they can not pay other ministers of the Gospel for their spiritual labors; or rather, why they can not consent to the payment of tithes as the particular species of payment demanded by the Church.

SECTION III.

The other reasons, as deducible from the history of Tithes, are the following—first, that they are not in equity dues of the Church—secondly, that the payment of them being compulsory, it would, if acceded to, be an acknowledgment that the civil magistrate had a right to use force in matters of religion—and thirdly, that, being claimed upon an act, which holds them forth as of divine right, any payment of them would be an acknowledgment of the Jewish religion, and that Christ had not yet actually come.

The other reasons which the Quakers have to give for refusing to support other ministers of the Gospel, may be now deduced from the nature of tithes, as explained in the former section.

The primitive members of this Society resisted the payment of

tithes for three reasons; and first, because they were demanded of them as dues to the Church.

Against this doctrine they set their faces as a religious body. They contended that if they were due at all, they were due to the poor, from whom they had been forcibly taken, and to whom in equity they still belonged; that no prince could alter the nature of right and wrong; that tithes were not justly due to the Church because Offa wished them to be so to expiate his own crimes, or because Ethelwolf wished them to be so from a superstitious notion that he might thus prevent the incursions of the Danes; or because Stephen wished them to be so, as his own grant expresses, on the principle that "the bonds of sin might be dissolved, and that he might have a part with those, who by a happy kind of commerce exchanged heavenly things for earthly;" or because the Popes of Rome wished them to be so, from whose jurisdiction all the subjects of England were discharged by law.

They resisted the payment of them because, secondly, tithes had become of a compulsory nature, or because they were compelled to pay them.

They contended on this head, that tithes had been originally free-will offerings, but that by violence they had been changed into dues to be collected by force; that nothing could be more clear than that ministers of the Gospel, if the instructions of Jesus to his Disciples were to be regarded, were not authorized even to demand, much less to force, a maintenance from others; and that any constrained payment of these, while it was contrary to his intention, would be an infringement of their great tenet, by which they held that, Christ's kingdom being of a spiritual nature, the civil magistrate had no right to dictate a religion to any one, nor to enforce payment from individuals for the same; and that any interference in those matters, which were solely between God and man, was neither more nor less than a usurpation of the prerogative of God.

They resisted the payment of them, because, thirdly, they were demanded on the principle, as appeared by the preamble of the Act of Henry the Eighth, that they were due, as under the Levitical law, by divine right.

Against this they urged, first, that if they were due as the Levitical tithes were, they must have been subject to the same conditions. They contended that if the Levites had a right to tithes, they had previously given up to the community their own right to a share of the land; but that the clergy claimed a tenth of the produce of the lands of others, but had given up none of their own. They contended also, that tithes by the Levitical law were for the strangers,

the fatherless, and the widows, as well as for the Levites; but that the clergy, by taking tithes, had taken that which had been for the maintenance of the poor, and had appropriated it solely to their own use, leaving the poor thus to become a second burthen upon the land.

But they contended that the principle itself was false. They maintained that the Levitical priesthood, and tithes with it, had ceased on the coming of Jesus Christ, as appeared by his own example and that of his Apostles; that it became them, therefore, as Christians to make a stand against this principle; for that by acquiescing in the notion that the Jewish law extended to them, they conceived that they would be acknowledging that the priesthood of Aaron still existed, and that Christ had not actually come.

This latter argument, by which it was insisted upon that tithes ceased with the Jewish dispensation, and that those, who acknowledged them, acknowledged the Jewish religion for Christian, was not confined to the early Quakers, but admitted among many other serious Christians of those times. The great John Milton himself, in a treatise which he wrote against tithes, did not disdain to use it: "Although," says he, "hire to the laborer be of moral and perpetual right, yet that special kind of hire, the tenth, can be of no right or necessity but to that special labor, to which God ordained it. That special labor was the Levitical and ceremonial service of the Tabernacle, which is now abolished; the right, therefore, of that special hire must needs be withal abolished, as being also ceremonial. That tithes were ceremonial is plain, not being given to the Levites till they had been first offered an heave-offering to the Lord. He, then, who by that law brings tithes into the Gospel, of necessity brings in withal a sacrifice and an altar, without which tithes by that law were unsanctified and polluted, and therefore never thought of in the first Christian times, nor till ceremonies, altars, and oblations had been brought back. And yet the Jews, ever since their temple was destroyed, though they have rabbies and teachers of their law, yet pay no tithes, as having no Levites to whom, no temple where to pay them, no altar whereon to hallow them; which argues that the Jews themselves never thought tithes moral, but ceremonial only. That Christians, therefore, should take them up when Jews have laid them down, must needs be very absurd and preposterous."

Having now stated the three great reasons, which the early Quakers gave in addition to those mentioned in a former section, why they could not contribute towards the maintenance of an alien ministry, or why they could not submit to the payment of tithes as the peculiar payment demanded by the Established Church, I shall only

observe, that these are still insisted upon by their descendants, but more particularly the latter, because all the more modern Acts upon this subject take the Act of Henry the Eighth as the great groundwork or legal foundation of tithes; in the preamble of which it is inserted, that "they are due to God and Holy Church." Now this preamble the Quakers assert has never been done away, nor has any other principle been acknowledged instead of that in this preamble, why tithes have been established by law. They conceive therefore that tithes are still collected on the foundation of divine right, and therefore that it is impossible for them as Christians to pay them; for that by every such payment they would not only be acknowledging the Jewish religion for themselves, but would be agreeing in sentiment with the modern Jews, that Jesus Christ has not yet made his appearance upon earth.

CHARACTER OF THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

Character of the Quakers — character of great importance in life — yet often improperly estimated — this the case with that of this Society — attempt to appreciate it duly—many outward circumstances in the constitution of the Quakers, which may be referred to as certain helps in the promotion of this attempt.

NOTHING is of more importance to an individual than a good character, during life. Posthumous reputation, however desirable it may be thought, is of no service to the person, whom it follows. But a living character, if it be excellent, is inestimable, on account of the good, which it produces to him, who possesses it. It procures him attention, civility, love, and respect from others. Hence virtue may be said to have a reward in the present life. This account will be also true of bodies, and particularly of religious bodies, of men. It will make a difference to the individuals of these, whether they be respected as a body by the individuals of other religious denominations, or by the Government, under which they live.

But though character is of so much importance in life, there are few who estimate it, either when they view it individually or collectively, as it really is. It is often, on the one hand, heightened by partiality; and, on the other, lowered by prejudice. Other causes also combine to afford wrong apprehensions concerning it. For as different diseases often throw out the same symptoms, and the judgment of the physician is baffled, so different motives frequently produce similar actions; and the man, who strives to develop a character, even if he wishes to speak truth, finds himself at a loss to pronounce justly upon it.

As these failings and difficulties have attended men in estimating the character of individuals, so they seem to have attended those, who have attempted to delineate that of the Society of the Quakers. Indeed, if we were to take a view of the different qualities, which have been assigned to the latter, we could not but conclude that there must have been some mistake concerning them. We should have occasion to observe, that some of these were so different in their kind, that they could not reasonably be supposed to exist in the

same persons. We should find that others could scarcely be admitted among a body of professing Christians. The Quaker-character, in short, as it has been exhibited to the world, is a strange medley of consistency and contradiction, and of merit and defect.

Amidst accounts, which have been so incongruous, I shall attempt the task of drawing the Character of the members of this Society. I shall state, first, all the excellencies that have been said to belong to it. I shall state also the blemishes, with which it has been described to be chargeable. I shall then inquire how far it is probable that any of these, and in what degree, are true. In this inquiry some little reliance must be placed upon my personal knowledge of its members, and upon my desire not to deceive. It is fortunate, however, that I shall be able in this case to apply to a test, which will be more satisfactory to the world than any opinion of my own upon this subject. I mean to say that the Quakers, like others, are the creatures of their own education and habits, or that there are circumstances in their constitution, the knowledge of which will assist us in the discussion of this question; circumstances, which will speak for themselves, and to which we may always refer in the case of difficulty or doubt. Their moral education, for example, which has been already explained, cannot but have an influence on the minds of those, who receive it. Their discipline also, which has appeared to be of so extraordinary a nature, and to be conducted in so extraordinary a manner, cannot but have an effect of its own kind. The peculiar customs, in which they have been described to have been born and educated, and which must of course act upon them as a second nature, must have a correspondent influence. From these and other prominent and distinguishing features in their constitution, I may hope to confirm some of the truths which have been told, and to correct some of the errors that have been stated, on the subject which is now before us.

Nor am I without the hope, that the discussion of this subject upon such principles will be acceptable to many. To those, who love truth, this attempt to investigate it will be interesting. To the Quakers it will be highly useful. For they will see in the glass or mirror, which I shall set before them, the appearance which they make in the world: and if they shall learn in consequence any of the causes either of their merits or of their failings, they will have learned a lesson, which they may make useful by the further improvement of their moral character.

CHAPTER II.

Good part of the character of the Quakers—this general or particular—great general trait is, that they are a moral people—this opinion of the world accounted for and confirmed by a statement of some of the causes that operate in the production of character—one of these causes is the discipline peculiar to this Society.

I come, according to my design, to the good part of the Character of the Society. This may be divided into two sorts,—into that which is general, and into that which is particular. On the subject of their general good Character I shall first speak.

It is admitted by the world, as I had occasion to observe in the first chapter of this volume, that, whatever other objections might be brought against the Quakers as a body, they deserved the character of a moral people.

Though this fact is admitted, and there appears therefore no necessity for confirming it, I shall endeavor, according to the plan proposed, to show, by means of the peculiar system of the Quakers as a religious body, that this is one of their traits given them by the world, which can not be otherwise than true.

The members of this Society believe, in the first place, that the Spirit of God, acting in man, is one of the causes of virtuous character. They believe it to be, of all others, the purest and sublimest source. It is that spring, they conceive, to good action, and of course to exalted character, in which man can have none but a passive concern. It is neither hereditary nor fictitious. It can neither be perpetuated in generation by the father of the child, nor be given by human art. It is considered by them as the great and distinguishing mark of their calling. Neither dress, nor language, nor peculiar customs, constitute the Quaker, but the spiritual knowledge which he possesses. Hence all pious men may be said to have belonged to this Society. Hence the Patriarchs were Quakers; that is, because they professed to be led by the Spirit of God. Hence the Apostles and primitive Christians were Quakers. Hence the virtuous among the Heathens, who know nothing of Christianity, were Quakers also. Hence Socrates may be ranked in profession with the members of this community. He believed in the agency of the Divine Spirit. It was said of him, "that he had the guide of his life within him; that this Spirit furnished him with divine knowledge; and that it often impelled him to address and exhort the people." Justin the Martyr had no scruple in calling both Socrates and Heraclitus Christians, though they lived long before Christ; "for all such as these,"

says he, "who lived according to the Divine Word within them, and which Word was in all men, were Christians." Hence also, since the introduction of Christianity, many of our own countrymen have been Quakers, though undistinguished by the exterior mark of dress or language. Among these we may reckon the great and venerable Milton. His works are full of the sentiments of Quakerism*. And hence, in other countries and in other ages, there have been men, who might be called Quakers, though the word Quakerism was unknown to them.

But independently of the agency of the Spirit of God, which the individuals of this Society thus consider to be the purest cause of a good life and character, we may reckon a subordinate cause, which may be artificial, and within the contrivance and wisdom of man. When the early Quakers met together as a religious body, though they consisted of spiritually-minded men, they resolved on a system of discipline, which should be followed by those who became members with them. This discipline we have already seen. We have seen how it attempts to secure obedience to Christian precepts; how it marks its offences: how it takes cognisance of them when committed; how it tries to reclaim and save:—how, in short, by endeavoring to keep up the members of the Society to a good life, it becomes instrumental in the production or preservation of a good character.

From hence it will appear that the virtue of the Quakers, and of course their character, may be distinguished into two kinds, as arising from two sources. It may arise from spiritual knowledge on the one hand, or from their discipline on the other. That, which arises from the first, will be a perfect virtue. It will produce activity in excellence. That, which arises from the second, will be inferior and sluggish. But, however it may be subject to this lower estimation, it will always be able to produce for those, who have it, a certain degree of moral reputation in the opinion of the world.

These distinctions having been made as to the sources of virtuous character, there will be no difficulty in showing that the world has not been deceived in the point in question. For if it be admitted that the Divine Spirit, by means of its agency on the heart of man, is really a cause of virtuous character, it will then be but reasonable to suppose that the Quakers, who lay themselves open for its reception more than others, both by frequent private retirements, and by

* Milton considered the Spirit of God as a divine teacher: he maintained also that the Scriptures were not to be spiritually understood but by the means of this Spirit. He believed also, that human learning was not necessary for the qualification of a Minister of the Gospel. And he wrote an Essay against Tithes.

their peculiar mode of public worship, should bear at least as fair a reputation as others on account of the purity of their lives. But the discipline, which is unquestionably a guardian of morals, is peculiar to themselves. Virtue is therefore kept up in the Society by an extraordinary cause, or by a cause, which does not act among many other bodies of men. It ought therefore to be expected, while this extraordinary cause exists, that an extraordinary result should follow; or that more will be kept apparently virtuous among the Quakers, in proportion to their numbers, than among those, where no such discipline can be found; or, in other words, that whenever the Quakers are compared with those of the world at large, they will obtain the reputation of a Moral People.

CHAPTER III.

SECTION I.

Particular traits in the Quaker-character—the first of these is benevolence—this includes good-will to man in his temporal capacity—Reasons why the world has bestowed this trait upon the members of this Society—Probability of its existence—from their ignorance of many of the degrading diversions of the world—from their great tenet on war—from their discipline, which inculcates equality—and watchfulness over morals—and from their doctrine, that man is the temple of the Holy Spirit.

Of the good traits in the Quaker-character, which may be called particular, I shall first notice that of Benevolence. This benevolence will include, first, good-will to man in his temporal capacity, or a tender feeling for him, as a fellow-creature in the varied situations of his life*.

The epithet of Benevolent has been long given to this Society. Indeed I know of no point where the judgment of the world has been called forth, in which it has been more unanimous than in the acknowledgment of this particular trait, as a part of the Quaker-character.

The reasons for the application of this epithet to the Society may be various.

---

* The reader must be aware that all the members do not partake of this good part of the character. That the generality do, I believe. That all ought to partake of it, I know; because their principles, as will be clearly seen, lead to such a character. They, therefore, who do not, will see their own deficiency, or how much they have yet to attain, before they can become Quakers.

It has been long known, that as the early Christians called each other Brethren, and loved each other as such, so there runs through the whole Society a system of similar love,—their affection for one another having been long proverbial.

It has been long known, again, that as the early Christians extended their benevolence out of the pale of their own community to others, who lived around them, so the Quakers manifest a similar disposition towards their countrymen at large. In matters of private distress, where persons of a different religious denomination have been the objects, and where such objects have been worthy, their purses have been generally open, and they have generally given as largely, in proportion to their abilities, as other people. To public charities in their respective places of residence they have generally administered their proper share. But, of late years, as they have mixed more with the world, this character has become more conspicuous, or better known. In the cases of dearth and distress, which happened a few years ago, it is a matter of publicity that they were amongst the foremost in the metropolis, and in some other towns in the kingdom, not only in procuring contributions, but in frequent and regular attendance for the proper distribution of them. And if their character had ever stood higher for willingness to contribute to the wants of others at any one time than at another, it stands the highest, from whatever cause it may happen, at the present day.

It has been long known, again, that as the early Christians extended their love beyond their own Society, and beyond those of the world who lived around them, to those who were reputed natural enemies in their own times, so the Quakers do not confine their benevolence to their own countrymen, but extend it to the various inhabitants of the globe, without any discrimination, whether they are reputed hostile or not to the Government under which they live. In times of war we never see them bearing arms; and in times of victory we never see them exulting, like other people. We never see them illuminating their houses, or running up and down the streets, frantic with joy, upon such occasions. Their joy, on the other hand, is wounded by the melancholy consideration of the destruction of the human race, when they lament with almost equal sympathy over the slaughter of enemies and friends.

But this character of a Benevolent People has been raised higher of late years in the estimation of the public by new circumstances, or by the unanimous and decided part, which they have taken as a body, in behalf of the Abolition of the Slave-trade. For where has the injured African experienced more sympathy than from the hearts of Quakers? In this great cause they have been singularly conspic-

uous. They have been actuated as it were by one spring. In the different attempts made for the annihilation of this trade, they have come forward with a religious zeal. They were at the original formation of the committee for this important object, where they gave an almost unexampled attendance for years. I mentioned in the preceding volume, that near a century ago, when this question had not awakened the general attention, it had awakened that of the individuals of this Society, and that they had made regulations in their commercial concerns, with a view of keeping themselves clear of the blood of this cruel traffic. And from that time to the present day they have never forgotten this subject. Their yearly Epistles notice it frequently, and whenever such notice is considered to be useful. And they hold themselves in readiness, on all fit occasions, to unite their efforts for the removal of this great and shocking source of suffering to their fellow-creatures.

But whether these are the reasons, or whether they are not the reasons, why the Quakers have been denominated Benevolent, nothing is more true than that this appellation has been bestowed upon them, and this by the consent of their countrymen. For we have only to examine our public prints to prove the truth of the assertion. We shall generally find there, that when there is occasion to mention the Society, the word "Benevolent" accompanies it.

The reader will perhaps be anxious to know how it happens, that the Quakers should possess this general feeling of benevolence in a degree so much stronger than the general body of their countrymen, that it should have become an acknowledged feature in their character. He will naturally ask, Does their Discipline produce it?—Do their religious tenets produce it?—What springs act upon these, which do not equally act upon other people?—The explanation of this phænomenon will be perfectly consistent with my design; for I purpose, as I stated before, to try the truth or falsehood of the different qualities assigned to the character of the Quakers by the test of probabilities, as arising from the nature of the customs or opinions, which they adopt. I shall endeavor therefore to show, that there are circumstances connected with their constitution, which have a tendency to make them look upon man in a less degraded and hostile, and in a more kindred and elevated light than many others. And when I have accomplished this, I shall have given that explanation of the phænomenon, or that confirmation of the trait, which, whether it may or may not satisfy others, has always satisfied myself.

The members of this community, in the first place, have seldom seen a man degraded by his vices. Unaccustomed to many of the diversions of the world, they have seldom, if ever, seen him in the

low condition of a hired buffoon or mimic. Men, who consent to let others degrade themselves for their sport, become degraded in their turn. And this degradation increases with the frequency of the spectacle. Persons in such habits are apt to lose sight of the dignity of mankind, and to consider the actors as made to administer to their pleasures,—or to consider them in an animal or a reptile light. But the Quakers, who know nothing of such spectacles, can not, at least as far as these are concerned, lose either their own dignity of mind, or behold others lose it. They can not therefore view men under the degrading light of animals for sport, or of purchaseable playthings.

And as they are not accustomed to consider their fellow-creatures as below themselves, so neither are they accustomed to look with enmity towards them. Their tenet on the subject of War, which has been so amply detailed, prevents any disposition of this kind. For they interpret those words of Jesus Christ, as I have before shown, which relate to injuries, as extending not to their fellow-citizens alone, but to every individual in the world; and his precept of loving enemies, as extending not only to those individuals of their own country, who may have any private resentment against them, but to those, who become reputed enemies in the course of wars;—so that they fix no boundaries of land or ocean, and no limits of kindred, to their love, but consider Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Bond and Free, as their Brethren. Hence neither fine nor imprisonment can induce them to learn the use of arms, so as to become qualified to fight against these, or to shed their blood. And this principle of love is not laid as it were upon the shelf, like a volume of obsolete laws, so that it may be forgotten,—but is kept alive in their memories by the testimony, which they are occasionally called to bear, or by the sufferings they undergo by distraints upon their property, and sometimes by short imprisonments, for refusing military service.

But while these circumstances may have some influence in the production of this trait of benevolence to man in the character of the Quakers, the one by preventing the hateful sight of the loss of his dignity, and the other by destroying the seeds of enmity towards him, there are others interwoven in their constitution, which will have a similar, though a stronger, tendency towards it.

The great system of equality, which their discipline daily teaches and enforces, will make them look with an equal eye towards all of the human race. Who can be less than a man in this Society, when the rich and poor have an equal voice in the exercise of its discipline, and when they fill equally the important offices that belong to it?

And who is there out of the Society, whom its members esteem more than human? They bow their knees or their bodies, as I have before noticed, to no man. They flatter no man on account of his riches or his station. They pay homage to no man on account of his rank or title. Stript of all trappings they view the creature man. If, then, they view him in this abstracted light, they can view him only as an equal. But in what other Society is it that a similar estimate is made of him? The world are apt in general to make too much of those in an elevated station; and those, again, in this station are apt to make less of others beneath them than they ought. Thus an under or an over-valuation of individuals generally takes place in society; from whence it will unavoidably happen, that if some men are classed a little below superior Beings, others will be classed but little above the brutes of the field.

Their discipline, again, has a tendency to produce in them an anxious concern for the good of their fellow-creatures. Man is considered, in the theory of this discipline, as a being, for whose spiritual welfare the members are bound to watch. They are to take an interest in his character and his happiness. If he be overtaken in a fault, he is not to be deserted, but reclaimed. No endeavor is to be spared for his restoration. He is considered, in short, as a creature worthy of all the pains and efforts that can be bestowed upon him.

The religion of the Quakers furnishes also a cause, which occasions them to consider man in an elevated light. They view him, as may be collected from the preceding volume, as a temple of the Spirit of God. There is no man so mean in station who is not made capable by them of feeling the presence of the Divinity within him. Neither sect, nor country, nor color, excludes him, in their opinion, from this presence. But it is impossible to view man as a tabernacle, in which the Divinity may reside, without viewing him in a dignified manner. And though this doctrine of the agency of the Spirit dwelling in man belongs to many other Christian Societies, yet it is no where so systematically acted upon as by that of the Quakers.

These considerations may probably induce the reader to believe, that the trait of benevolence, which has been affixed to the Quaker-character, has not been given it in vain. There can be no such feeling for the moral interests of man, or such a benevolent attention towards him in his temporal capacity, where men have been accustomed to see one another in low and degrading characters, as where no such spectacles have occurred: nor can there be such a genuine or well-founded love towards him, where men, on a signal given by their respective Governments, transform their pruning-hooks into spears, and become tigers to one another without any private provo-

cation, as where they can be brought under no condition whatever to lift up their arm to the injury of any of the human race. There must, in a practical system of equality, be a due appreciation of man as man. There must, in a system, where it is a duty to watch over him for his good, be a tender affection towards him as a fellow-creature. And in a system, which considers him as a temple in which the Divine Being may dwell, there must be a respect towards him, which will have something like the appearance of a benevolent disposition to the world.

SECTION II.

Trait of benevolence includes, again, good-will towards man in his religious capacity—Quakers said to have no spirit of persecution, nor to talk with bitterness respecting other religious sects—this trait probable—because, nothing in their doctrine that narrows love—their sufferings on the other hand—and their law against detraction—and their aversion to make religion a subject of common talk—all in favor of this trait.

The word Benevolence, when mentioned as a trait in the character of the Society, includes also good-will to man in his religious capacity.

It has often been observed of the Quakers, that they show no spirit of persecution, and that you seldom hear them talk with bitterness respecting other religious Societies.

On the first part of this amiable quality it may be observed, that they have never had any great power of exercising dominion over others in matters of religion. In America, where they have had the greatest, they have conducted themselves well. William Penn secured to every colonist the full rights of men as to religious opinion and worship. If the spirit of persecution is ever to be traced to them, it must be found in their writings on the subject of Religion. In one or two of the productions of their first authors, who were obliged to support their opinions by controversy, there is certainly an appearance of an improper warmth of temper; but it is remarkable that, since those times, scarcely a book has appeared, written by a Quaker, against the religion of another. Satisfied with their own religious belief, they seem to have wished only to be allowed to enjoy it in peace. For when they have appeared as polemical writers, it has been principally in defense of themselves.

On the second part of this amiable quality I may remark, that it is possible, in the case of tithes, where their temper has been tried by expensive distraints and hard imprisonments, that they may utter a harsh expression against a system, which they believe to be antichristian, and which they consider also as repugnant to equity, inas-

much as it compels them to pay laborers, who perform no work in their own harvest. But this feeling is only temporary, and is seldom extended beyond the object that produces it. They have never, to my knowledge, spoken with bitterness against Churchmen on this account. Nor have I ever heard them, in such a season of suffering, pass the slightest reflection upon their faith.

That this trait of benevolence to man in his religious capacity is probably true, I shall endeavor to show according to the method I have proposed.

There is nothing, in the first place, in the religious doctrines of the Society, which can produce a narrowness of mind in religion, or a contempt for the creeds of others. I have certainly in the course of my life known some bigots in religion; though, like the Quakers, I censure no man for his faith. I have known some, who have considered Baptism and the Sacrament of the Supper as such essentials in Christianity, as to deny that those, who scrupled to admit them, were Christians. I have known others pronouncing an anathma against persons, because they did not believe the Atonement in their own way. I have known others, again, who have descended into the greatest depths of Election and Reprobation, instead of feeling an awful thankfulness for their own condition as the elect, and the most tender and affectionate concern for those, whom they consider to be the reprobate, indulging a kind of spiritual pride on their own account, which has ended in a contempt for others. Thus the doctrines of Christianity, wonderful to relate, have been made to narrow the love of Christians! The Quaker-religion, on the other hand, knows no such feelings as these. It considers the Spirit of God as visiting all men in their day, and as capable of redeeming all, and this without any exception of persons; and that the difference of creeds, invented by the human understanding, will make no difference in the eternal happiness of man. Thus, it does not narrow the sphere of salvation; it does not circumscribe it either by numerical or personal limits. There does not appear, therefore, to be in the doctrines of the Quaker-religion any thing that should narrow their love to their fellow-creatures, or any thing that should generate a spirit of rancor or contempt towards others, on account of the religion they profess.

There are, on the contrary, circumstances, which have a tendency to produce an opposite effect.

I see, in the first place, no reason why the general spirit of benevolence to man in his temporal capacity, which runs through the whole Society, should not be admitted as having some power in checking a bitter spirit towards him in his religious character.

I see, again, that the sufferings which individuals of this community so often undergo on account of their religious opinions, ought to have an influence with them in making them tender towards others on the same subject. Virgil makes the Queen of Carthage say to Æneas,

"Haud ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco;"

or, "Not unacquainted with misfortunes myself, I learn to succor the unfortunate."—So one would hope, that the Quakers, of all people, ought to know how wrong it is to be angry with another for his religion.

With respect to that part of the trait, which relates to speaking acrimoniously of other sects, there are particular circumstances in the customs and discipline of the Society, which seem likely to prevent it.

It is a law of the Society, enforced by their discipline, as I showed in a former volume, that no member is to be guilty of detraction or slander. Any person breaking this law would come under admonition, if found out. This induces an habitual caution or circumspection in speech, where persons are made the subject of conversation. And I have no doubt that this law would act as a preventive in the case before us.

It is not a custom, again, with the Quakers to make religion a subject of common talk. They, who know them, know well how difficult it is to make them converse either upon their own faith or upon the faith of others. They believe that topics on religion, familiarly introduced, tend to weaken its solemnity upon the mind. They exclude such subjects also from ordinary conversation, upon another principle. For they believe that religion should not be introduced at these times, unless it can be made edifying. But if it is to be made edifying, it is to come, they conceive, not through the medium of the activity of the imagination of man, but through the passiveness of the soul under the influence of the Divine Spirit.

SECTION III.

Trait of benevolence includes, again, a tender feeling towards the brute-creation —Quakers remarkable for their tenderness to animals—this feature produced from their doctrine, that animals are not mere machines, but the creatures of God, the end of whose existence is always to be attended to in their treatment—and from their opinion as to what ought to be the influence of the Gospel, as recorded in their own Summary.

THE word Benevolence, when applied to the character of the Society, includes also a tender feeling towards the brute-creation.

It has frequently been observed by those, who are acquainted with its members, that all animals belonging to them are treated with a tender consideration, and are not permitted to be abused; and that they feel in like manner for those, which may be oppressed by others; so that their conduct is often influenced in some way or other upon such occasions.

It will be obvious, in inquiring into the truth of this quality in the character of the Quakers, that the same principles, which I have described as co-operating to produce benevolence towards men, are not applicable to the species in question. But benevolence, when once rooted in the heart, like a healthy plant, from whatever causes it may spring, will in time enlarge itself. The man, who is remarkable for his kindness towards man, will always be found to extend it towards the creatures around him. It is an ancient saying, that "a righteous man regards the life of his beast, but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel."

But, independently of this consideration, there is a principle in the Quaker constitution, which, if it be attended to, cannot but give birth to the trait in question.

It has been shown in the first volume, on the subject of the Diversions of the Field, that the Quakers consider animals not as mere machines to be used at discretion, but in the sublime light of the creatures of God, of whose existence the use and intention ought always to be considered, and to whom rights arise from various causes, any violation of which is a violation of a moral law.

This principle, if they attend to it, must, as I have just observed, secure all animals, which may belong to them, from oppression. They must so consider the end of their use, as to defend them from abuse. They must so calculate their powers and their years, as to shield them from excessive labor. They must so anticipate their feelings, as to protect them from pain. They must so estimate their instinct, and make an allowance for their want of understanding, as not to attach to their petty mischiefs the necessity of an unbecoming revenge. They must act towards them, in short, as created for special ends, and must consider themselves as their guardians, that these ends may not be perverted, but attained.

To this it may be added, that the printed Summary of the Religion of the Society constantly stares them in the face, in which it is recorded what ought to be the influence of Christianity on this subject. "We are also clearly of the judgment, that, if the benevolence of the Gospel were generally prevalent in the minds of men, it would even influence their conduct in the treatment of the brute-creation, which would no longer groan the victims of their avarice, or of their false ideas of pleasure."

CHAPTER IV.

Second trait is that of Complacency of Mind, or Quietness of Character—this trait confirmed by circumstances in their education, discipline, and public worship, which are productive of quiet personal habits—and by their disuse of the diversions of the world—by the mode of the settlement of their differences—by their efforts in the subjugation of their will—by their endeavor to avoid all activity of mind during their devotional exercises—all of which are productive of a quiet habitude of mind.

A SECOND trait in the character of the Society is that of Complacency, or Evenness, or Quietness of Mind and Manner.

This trait is, I believe, almost as generally admitted by the world as that of Benevolence. It is a matter of frequent observation, that you seldom see an irascible Quaker. And it is by no means uncommon to hear persons, when the members of this Society are the subject of conversation, talking of the mysteries of their education, or wondering how it happens that they should be brought to possess such a calmness and quietness of character.

There will be no difficulty in substantiating this second trait.

There are circumstances, in the first place, in the constitution of the Quaker-system, which, as it must have already appeared, must be generative of quiet personal habits. Among these may be reckoned their education. They are taught in early youth to rise in the morning in quietness; to go about their ordinary occupations in quietness; and to retire in quietness to their beds. We may reckon also their discipline. They are accustomed by means of this, when young, to attend the monthly and quarterly meetings, which are often of long continuance. Here they are obliged to sit patiently. Here they hear the grown-up members speak in order, and without any interruption of one another. We may reckon, again, their public worship. Here they are accustomed occasionally to silent meetings, or to sit quietly for a length of time,—when not a word is spoken.

There are circumstances, again, in the constitution of the Society, which are either preventive of mental activity and excitement of passion, or productive of a quiet habitude of mind. Forbidden the use of cards, and of music, and of dancing, and of the theater, and of novels, it must be obvious that the individuals now under our consideration cannot experience the same excitement of the passions as they who are permitted the use of these common amusements of the world. In consequence of an obligation to have recourse to arbitration, as the established mode of decision in the case of differences with one another, they learn to conduct themselves with temper and

decorum in exasperating cases. They avoid, in consequence, the phrensy of him, who has recourse to violence, and the turbid state of mind of him, who engages in suits at law. It may be observed also, that if, in early youth, their evil passions are called forth by other causes, it is considered as a duty to quell them. The early subjugation of the will is insisted upon in all genuine Quaker families. The children of such are rebuked, as I have had occasion to observe, for all expressions of anger, as tending to raise those feelings, which ought to be suppressed. A raising even of their voice is discouraged, as leading to the disturbance of their minds. This is done to make them calm and passive, that they may be in a state to receive the influence of the pure Principle. It may be observed, again, that in their meetings for worship, whether silent or vocal, they endeavor to avoid all activity of the mind, for the same reason.

These different circumstances, then, by producing quiet personal habits on the one hand, and quiet mental ones on the other, concur in producing a complacency of mind and manner; so that a Quaker is daily as it were at school, as far as it relates to the formation of a quiet character.

CHAPTER V.

Third trait is, that they do not temporize, or do that, which they believe to be improper as a body of Christians—subjects, in which this trait is conspicuous—Civil oaths—Holy or consecrated days—War—Tithes—Language—Address—Public Illuminations—Utility of this trait to their character.

It is a third trait in the character of the Quakers, that they refuse to do whatever, as a religious body, they believe to be wrong.

I shall have no occasion to state any of the remarks of the world to show their belief of the existence of this good quality, nor to apply to circumstances within the constitution of the Quakers to confirm it. The trait is almost daily conspicuous in some subject or another. It is kept alive by their discipline. It is known to all who know them. I shall satisfy myself, therefore, with a plain historical relation concerning it.

It has been an established rule with them, from the formation of their Society, not to temporize, or to violate their consciences; or, in other words, not to do that, which as a body of Christians they believe to be wrong, though the usages of the world, or the Government of the country under which they live, should require it; but rather to submit to the frowns and indignation of the one, and the

legal penalties annexed to their disobedience by the other. This suffering, in preference of the violation of their consciences, is what they call "the bearing of their testimony," or a demonstration to the world, by the "testimony of their own example," that they consider it to be the duty of Christians rather to suffer, than have any concern with that, which they conceive to be evil.

The Quakers, in putting this principle into practice, stand, I believe, alone; for I know of no other Christians, who as a body pay this homage to their scruples, or who determine upon an ordeal of suffering, in preference of a compromise with their ease and safety*.

The subjects, in which this trait is conspicuous, are of two kinds: first, as they relate to things enjoined by the Government; and, secondly, as they relate to things enjoined by the customs or fashions of the world.

In the first case there was formerly much more suffering than there is at present, though the Quakers still refuse a compliance with as many injunctions of the law as they did in their early times.

It has been already stated, that they refused, from the very institution of their Society, to take a civil oath. The sufferings, which they underwent in consequence, have been explained also. But happily, by the indulgence of the Legislature, they are no longer persecuted for this scruple, though they still persevere in it, their affirmation having been made equal to an oath in most civil cases.

It has been stated, again, that they protested against the religious observance of many of those days, which the Government of the country from various considerations had ordered to be kept as holy. In consequence of this they were grievously oppressed in the early times of their history. For when their shops were found open on Christmas-day, and on Good-Friday, and on the different Fast-days, which had been appointed, they were taken up and punished by the magistrates on the one hand, and insulted and beaten by the people on the other. But, notwithstanding this ill usage, they persevered as rigidly in the non-observance of particular days and times, as in their non-compliance with oaths; and they still persevere in it. It does not appear, however, that the bearing of their testimony in this case is any longer a source of much vexation or trouble to them; for though the Government of the country still sanctions the consecration of particular days, and the great majority of the people join in it, there seems to have been a progressive knowledge or civilization

* The Moravians, I believe, protest against war upon scriptural grounds. But how far in this, or in any other case, they bear a testimony, like the Quakers, by suffering, I do not know.

in both, which has occasioned them to become tender on account of this singular deviation from their own practice.

But though they have been thus relieved by the Legislature, and by the more mild and liberal disposition of the people, from so much suffering in bearing their testimony on the two occasions, which have been mentioned; yet there are others, where the laws of Government are concerned, on which they find themselves involved in a struggle between the violation of their consciences and a state of suffering. and where unfortunately there is no remedy at hand, without the manifestation of greater partiality towards them than it may be supposed an equal administration of justice to all would warrant.

The first of these occasions is, when military service is enjoined. The Quakers, when drawn for the militia, refuse either to serve, or to furnish substitutes. For this refusal they come under the cognisance ot the laws. Their property, where they have any, is of course distrained upon, and a great part of a little substance is sometimes taken from them on this account. Where they have not distrainable property, which is occasionally the case, they never fly, but submit to the known punishment, and go patiently to prison. The Legislature, however, has not been inattentive to them even upon this occasion; for it has limited their confinement to three months. The Government also of the country afforded lately, in a case in which they were concerned, an example of attention to religious scruples upon this subject. In the late bill for arming the country *en masse*, both the Quakers and the Moravians were exempted from military service. This homage to religious principle did the authors of these exemptions the highest honor. And it certainly becomes the members of this Society to be grateful for this unsolicited favor; and as it was bestowed upon them in the full belief that they were the people they professed themselves, they should be particularly careful that they do not, by any inconsistency of conduct, tarnish the high reputation, which has been attached to them by the Government. under which they live.

The second occasion is, when tithes or other dues are demanded by the Church. The Quakers refuse the payment of these upon principles, which have been already explained. They come of course. again, under the cognisance of the laws. Their property is annually distrained upon, by warrant from justices of the peace, where the demand does not exceed the value of ten pounds; and this is their usual suffering in this case. But there have not been wanting instances, where an annual hardness of heart has suggested a process,

still allowable by the law, which has deprived them of all their property, and consigned them for life to the habitation of a prison*.

But it is only in cases, of which the laws of the land take cognisance, that they prefer suffering, to doing that, which their consciences disapprove. There are other cases, connected, as I observed before, with the opinion of the world, where they exhibit a similar example. If they believe any custom or fashion of the world to be evil in itself, or to be attended with evil, neither popular applause nor popular fury can make them follow it; but they think it right to bear their testimony against it by its disuse, and to run the hazard of all the ridicule, censure, or persecution, which may await them for so doing.

In these cases, as in the former, it must be observed, that the sufferings of the Quakers have been much diminished, though they still refuse a compliance, in as many instances as formerly, with the fashions of the world.

It was stated in the first volume, that they substituted the word Thou for You, in order that they might avoid by their words, as well as by their actions, any appearance of flattery to man. It was stated also, that they suffered on this account; that many magistrates, before whom they were carried in the early times of their institution, occasioned their punishment to be more severe; and that they were often abused and beaten by others, and put in danger of their lives. This persecution, however, for this singularity in their language has long ceased, and the substitution of Thou for You is now only considered as an innocent distinction between them and other people.

It was stated, again, in the same volume, that they abstained from the usual address of the world,—such as pulling off their hats, and

---

* One died not a great while ago in York Castle; and others, who were confined with him, would have shared his fate but for the interference of the King.

It is surprising that the Clergy should not unite in promoting a bill in parliament to extend the authority of the justices to grant warrants of distraint for tithes to more than the value of ten pounds, and to any amount, as this is the most cheap and expeditious way for themselves. If they apply to the Ecclesiastical Courts, they can enforce no payment of their tithes there. They can put the poor Quaker into prison, but they can not obtain their debt. If they apply to the Exchequer, they may find themselves at the conclusion of their suit, and this after a delay of three years, liable to the payment of extra costs to the amount of forty or fifty pounds; with which they can not charge the Quaker, though they may confine him for life. Some, to my knowledge, have been glad to abandon these suits, and put up with the costs incurred in them, rather than continue them. Recourse to such Courts occasions the Clergy frequently to be charged with cruelty, when, if they had only understood their own interests better, they would have avoided them.

bowing the body, and other ceremonious usages. It was explained also, that they did this on two principles. First, because, as such ceremonies were no real mark of obeisance, friendship, or respect, they ought to be discouraged by a people, whose religion required that no image should be held out, which was not a faithful picture of its original, and that no action should be resorted to, which was not correspondent with the feelings of the heart. Secondly, because all such ceremonies were of a complimentary or flattering nature, and were expressly forbidden by Jesus Christ. It was stated also, that, on account of their rejection of such outward usages, their hats were forcibly taken from their heads, and thrown away; that they were often beaten and imprisoned on this sole account; and that the world refused to deal with them as tradesmen; in consequence of which many could scarcely supply their families with bread. But this deviation from the general practice, though it still characterizes the members of this Society, is no longer a source of suffering to them. Magistrates sometimes take care that their hats shall be taken gently from their heads on public occasions, and private persons expect now no such homage from Quakers when they meet them.

There is, however, a custom, against which they anciently bore their testimony, and against which they continue to bear it, which subjects them occasionally to considerable inconvenience and loss. In the case of general illuminations they never light up their houses, but have the courage to be singular in this respect, whatever may be the temper of the mob.

They believe, that the practice of general illuminations cannot be adopted consistently by persons, who are lovers of the Truth. They consider it as no certain criterion of joy. For, in the first place, how many light up their houses, whose hearts are overwhelmed with sorrow! And, in the second place, the event, which is celebrated, may not always be a matter of joy to good minds. The birth-day of a prince, for example, may be ushered in as welcome, and the celebration of it may call his actions to mind, upon which a reflection may produce pleasure; but the celebration of the slaughter or devastation of mankind can afford no happiness to the Christian.

They consider the practice, again, accompanied as it is with all its fiery instruments, as dangerous and cruel. For, how many accidents have happened, and how many lives have been lost, upon such occasions!

They consider it, again, as replete with evil. The wild uproar which it creates, the mad and riotous joy which it produces, the

licentiousness which it favors, the invidious comparisons which it occasions, the partial favor which it fixes on individuals who have probably no moral merit, the false joys which it holds out, and the enmity which it has on some occasions a tendency to perpetuate, are so many additional arguments against it in the opinion of the Quakers.

For these and other reasons they choose not to submit to the custom, but to bear their testimony against it, and to run the hazard of having their windows broken, or their houses pillaged, as the populace may dictate. And in the same manner, if there be any other practice, in which the world may expect them to coincide, they reject it, fearless of the consequences, if they believe it to be productive of evil.

This noble practice of bearing testimony by which a few individuals attempt to stem the torrent of immorality by opposing themselves to its stream. and which may be considered as a living martyrdom, does, in a moral point of view, a great deal of good to those, who conscientiously adopt it. It recalls first principles to their minds. It keeps in their remembrance the religious rights of man. It teaches them to reason upon principle, and to make their estimates by a moral standard. It is productive both of patience and of courage. It occasions them to be kind, and attentive, and merciful, to those, who are persecuted and oppressed. It throws them into the presence of the Divinity when they are persecuted themselves. In short, it warms their moral feelings, and elevates their religious thoughts. Like oil, it keeps them from rusting. Like a whetstone, it gives them a new edge. Take away this practice from the constitution of the members of this Society, and you pull down a considerable support of their moral character. It is a great pity, that, as professing Christians, we should not more of us incorporate this noble principle individually into our religion. We concur unquestionably in customs, through the fear of being reputed singular, of which our hearts do not always approve, though nothing is more true than that a Christian is expected to be singular with respect to the corruptions of the world. What an immensity of good would be done, if cases of persons, choosing rather to suffer than to temporize, were so numerons as to attract the general notice of men! Would not every case of suffering operate as one of the most forcible lessons, that could be given, to those who should see it? And how long would that infamous system have to live, which makes a distinction between political expediency and moral right?

CHAPTER VI.

A fourth trait is, that in political affairs they reason upon principle, and not from consequences—this mode of reasoning insures the adoption of the maxim of not doing evil that good may come—had Quakers been legislators, many public evils had been avoided, which are now known in the world—existence of this trait probable from the influence of the former trait—and from the influence of the peculiar customs of the Quakers—and from the influence of their system of discipline upon their minds.

The next trait, which I shall lay open to the world as belonging to the Quaker-character, is that in all those cases, which may be called political, the members of this Society generally reason upon principle, and but seldom upon consequences.

I do not know of any good quality, which ever impressed me more, in all my intercourse with them, than this. It was one of those, which obtruded itself to my notice on my first acquaintance with them, and it has continued equally conspicuous to the present time.

If an impartial philosopher from some unknown land, and to whom our manners and opinions and history were unknown, were introduced suddenly into our metropolis, and were to converse with the Quakers there on a given political subject, and to be directly afterwards conveyed to the west end of the town, and there to converse with politicians, or men of fashion, or men of the world, upon the same, he could not fail to be greatly surprised. If he thought the former wise, or virtuous, or great, he would unavoidably consider the latter as foolish, or vicious, or little. Two such opposite conclusions, as he would hear deduced from the reasonings of each, would impress him with an idea that he had been taken to a country inhabited by two different races of men. He would never conceive that they had been educated in the same country, or under the same Government. If left to himself he would probably imagine that they had embraced two different religions. But if he were told that they professed the same, he would then say that the precepts of this religion had been expressed in such doubtful language, that they led to two sets of principles contradictory to one another. I need scarcely inform the reader that I allude to the two opposite conclusions, which will almost always be drawn, where men reason from motives of policy or from moral right.

If it be true that the Quakers reason upon principle in political affairs, and not upon consequences, it will follow as a direct inference, that they will adopt the Christian maxim that men ought not to do evil that good may come. And this is, indeed, the maxim,

which you find them adopting in the course of their conversation on such subjects, and which I believe they would uniformly have adopted, if they had been placed in political situations in life. Had they been the legislators of the world, we should never have seen many of the public evils that have appeared in it. It was thought formerly, for example, a glorious thing to attempt to drive Paganism from the Holy Land; but Quakers would never have joined in any of the crusades for its expulsion. It has been long esteemed, again, a desideratum in politics, that among nations differing in strength and resources a kind of balance of power should be kept up; but Quakers would never have engaged in any one war to preserve it. It has been thought, again, that it would contribute to the happiness of the natives of India, if the blessings of the British constitution could be given them instead of their own; but Quakers would never have taken possession of their territories for the accomplishment of such a good. It has been long thought, again, a matter of great political importance, that our West India settlements should be cultivated by African laborers; but Quakers would never have allowed a slave-trade for such a purpose. It has been thought, again, and it is still thought a desirable thing, that our property should be secured from the petty depredations of individuals; but Quakers would never have consented to capital punishments for such an end. In short, few public evils would have arisen among mankind, if statesmen had adopted the system, upon which the Quakers reason in political affairs, or if they had concurred with an ancient Grecian philosopher, in condemning to destruction the memory of the man, who first made a distinction between expediency and moral right.

That this trait of reasoning upon principle, regardless of the consequences, is likely to be a feature in the character of the Society, we are warranted in pronouncing, when we discover no fewer than three circumstances in the constitution of it, which may be causes in producing it*.

This trait seems, in the first place, to be the direct and legitimate offspring of that explained in the last chapter. For every time an individual is called upon to bear his testimony by suffering, whether in the case of a refusal to comply with the laws or with the customs and fashions of the land, he is called upon to refer to his own conscience, against his own temporal interest and against the opinion of the world. The moment he gives up principle for policy in the

* The Sierra Leone Company, which was founded for laudable purposes, might have been filled by Quakers; but when they understood that there was to be a fort and depot of arms in the settlement, they declined becoming proprietors.

course of his reasoning upon such occasions, then he does as many others do, that is, he submits to the less inconvenience; and then he ceases to be a Quaker. But while he continues to bear his testimony, it is a proof that he makes expediency give way to what he imagines to be right. The bearing of testimony, where it is conscientiously done, is therefore the parent, as it is also the bulwark and guardian, of reasoning upon principle. It throws out a memento, whenever it is practised, and habituates the subject of it to reason in this manner.

But this trait is nourished and supported, again, by other causes; and, first, by the influence, which the peculiar customs of the Quakers must occasionally have upon their minds. An individual can not go out of doors but he is reminded of his own singularities, or of his difference in a variety of respects from his fellow-citizens. Now every custom, in which he is singular, whether it be that of dress, or of language, or of address, or any other, is founded in his own mind on moral principle, and in direct opposition to popular opinion and applause. He is therefore perpetually reminded, in almost all his daily habits, of the two opposite systems of reasoning, and is perpetually called upon, as it were, to refer to the principles, which originally made the difference between him and another citizen of the world.

Neither has the discipline of the Society a less tendency to the production of the quality in question. For the business, which is transacted in the monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, is transacted under the deliberation of grave and serious men, who consider themselves as frequently under the divine influence, or as spiritually guided, on such occasions. In such assemblies it would be thought strange, if any sentiment were uttered, which savored of expediency in opposition to moral right. The youth, therefore, who are present, see no other determination of any question than by a religious standard. Hence these meetings operate as schools, in which they are habituated to reason upon principle, and to the exclusion of all worldly considerations, which may suggest themselves in the discussion of any point.

CHAPTER VII.

A fifth trait is, that they have an extraordinary independence of mind—this probable, because it must be the result of the former trait—because likely to be produced by their discipline—by their peculiar customs—and by their opinions on the supposed dignity of situations in life—because, again, they are not vulnerable by the seduction of Governments—or by the dominion of the Church—or by the power of fashion, and of the opinion of the world.

THE next trait, conspicuous in the character of the Society, and which is nearly allied to the former, is that of Independence of Mind.

This feature is of long standing, having been coeval with the Society itself. It was observed by Cromwell, that "he could neither win the Quakers by money, nor by honors, nor by places, as he could other people." A similar opinion is entertained of them at the present day. For of all people it is generally supposed that they are the least easily worked upon, or the least liable to be made tools or instruments in the hands of others. Who, for example, could say on any electioneering occasion, whatever his riches might be, that he could command their votes?

There will be no difficulty in believing this to be a real feature in the character of the Society; for, when men are accustomed to refer matters to their reason, and to reason upon principle, they will always have an independenee of mind, from a belief that they are right. and wherever it is a maxim with them not to do evil that good may come, they will have a similar independence, from a consciousness that they have never put themselves into the power of the world. Hence this independence of mind must be a result of the trait explained in the former chapter.

But in looking into the constitution of the Quakers, we shall find it full of materials for the production of this noble trait.

Their discipline has an immediate tendency to produce it; for in no community does a man feel him so independent as a man. A Quaker is called upon in his own Society to the discharge of important offices. He sits as a representative, a legislator, and a judge. In looking round him he finds all equal in privileges, but none superior to himself.

Their peculiar customs have the same tendency; for they teach them to value others, who are not of the Society, by no other standard than that, by which they estimate themselves. They neither take off their hats, nor bow, nor scrape. In their speech they abstain from the use of flattering words or of titles. In their

letters they never subscribe themselves the humble servants of any one. They never use, in short, any action or signature, which, serving as a mark of elevation to others, has any influence towards the degradation of themselves.

Their opinions also upon the supposed dignity of situations in life contribute towards the promotion of this independence of their minds.

They value no man, in the first place, on account of his earthly title. They pay respect to magistrates, and to all the nobility of the land, in their capacity of legislators, whom the chief magistrate has appointed; but they believe that the mere letters in a schedule of parchment can give no more intrinsic worth to a person than they possess themselves; and they think with Juvenal, that "the only true nobility is virtue." Hence titles, in the glare of which some people lose the dignity of their vision, have no magical effect upon Quakers.

They value no man, again, on account of the antiquity of his family-exploits. They believe that there are people now living in low and obscure situations, whose ancestors performed in the childhood of history, when it was ignorant and incapable of perpetuating traditions, as great feats as those, which in its greater maturity it has recorded. And as far as these exploits of antiquity may be such as were performed in wars, they would not be valued by them as ornaments to men, of whose worth they can only judge by their virtuous or their Christian character.

They value no man, again, on account of the antiquity of his ancestors. Believing Revelation to contain the best account of the rise of man, they consider all families as equally old in their origin, because they believe them to have sprung from the same two parents, as their common source.

But this independence of mind, which is said to belong to the members of this Society, may be fostered, again, by other circumstances, some of which are peculiar to themselves.

Many men allow the independence of their minds to be broken by an acceptance of the honors offered to them by the Governments under which they live; but no Quaker could accept of the honors of the world.

Others allow the independence of their minds to be invaded by the acceptance of places and pensions from the same quarter. But Quakers, generally speaking, are in a situation too independent, in consequence of their industry, to need any support of this kind; and none of them could accept it on the terms, on which it is usually given.

Others, again, suffer their opinions to be fettered by the authority of Ecclesiastical dominion; but the Quakers have broken all such chains. They depend upon no minister of the Gospel for their religion, nor do they consider the priesthood as a distinct order of men.

Others, again, come under the dominion of fashion and of popular opinion, so that they dare only do that which they see others do, or are hurried from one folly to another, without having the courage to try to resist the stream. But the life of a Quaker is a continual state of independence in this respect, being a continual protest against many of the customs and opinions of the world.

I shall now only observe upon this subject, that this quality of independence of mind, which is likely to be generated by some, and which is preserved by others of the causes which have been mentioned, is not confined to a few members, but runs through the Society. It belongs to the poor as well as to the rich, and to the servants of a family as well as to those, who live in poverty by themselves. If a poor member were to be introduced to a man of rank, he would neither degrade himself by flattery on the one hand, nor by any unbecoming submission on the other. He would neither be seduced into that which was wrong, nor intimidated from doing that which was right, by the splendor or authority of appearances about him. He would still preserve the independence of his mind, though he would behave with respect. You would never be able to convince him that he had been talking with a person, who had been fashioned differently from himself. This trait of independence can not but extend itself to the poor; for, having the same rights and privileges in the discipline, and the same peculiar customs, and the same views of men and manners as the rest of the Society, a similar disposition must be found in these, unless it be counteracted by other causes. But as Quaker-servants, who live in genuine Quaker-families, wear no liveries, nor any badge of poverty or servitude, there is nothing in the opposite scale to produce an opposite feature in their character.

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION I.

A sixth trait is that of Fortitude—this includes, first, courage in life—courage not confined to military exploits—Quakers seldom intimidated or abashed—dare to say what they think—and to do what they believe to be right—this trait may arise from that of bearing their testimony—and from those circumstances, which produced independence of mind—and from the peculiar customs of the Society.

Another feature in the character of the Society, which is nearly allied to Independence of Mind, is Fortitude. This fortitude is conspicuous both in life and in the hour of death. That which belongs to the former instance I shall consider first.

If courage in life were confined solely to military exploits, the individuals now under our consideration would have no pretension to this character. But courage consists of presence of mind in many situations of peril different from those in war. It consists often in refusing to do that which is wrong, in spite of popular opinion. Hence a man, who refuses a challenge, and whom men of honor would brand with cowardice on that account, may have more real courage in so doing, and would have it in the estimation of moral men, than the person who sends it. It may consist also in an inflexible perseverance in doing that which is right, when persecution is to follow. Such was the courage of martyrdom. As courage, then, may consist in qualities different from that of heroism, we shall see what kind of courage it is that has been assigned to the Quakers, and how far they may be expected to be entitled to such a trait.

There is no question, in the first place, that Quakers have great presence of mind on difficult and trying occasions. To frighten or to put them off their guard would be no easy task. Few people have ever seen an innocent Quaker disconcerted or abashed.

They have the courage also to dare to say, at all times and in all places, what they believe to be right.

I might appeal for the truth of this, as far as the primitive members are concerned, to the different conversations, which George Fox had with Oliver Cromwell, or to the different letters, which he wrote to him as Protector, or to those, which he afterwards wrote to King Charles the Second.

I might appeal, again, to the address of Edward Burroughs to the same monarch.

I might appeal, again, to the bold but respectful language, which the early Quakers used to the magistrates when they were carried

before them; and to the intrepid and dignified manner, in which they spoke to their judges, in the course of the numerous trials, to which they were brought in those early times.

I might appeal, also, to Barclay's Address to the King, which stands at the head of his Apology.

"As it is inconsistent," says Barclay to King Charles the Second, "with the truth I bear, so it is far from me to use this letter as an engine to flatter thee, the usual design of such works; and therefore I can neither dedicate it to thee, nor crave thy patronage, as if thereby I might have more confidence to present it to the world, or be more hopeful of its success. To God alone I owe what I have, and that more immediately in matters spiritual; and therefore to him alone, and the service of his truth, I dedicate whatever work he may bring forth in me, to whom alone the praise and honor appertain, whose truth needs not the patronage of worldly princes, his arm and power being that alone, by which it is propagated, established, and confirmed."

And further on he says, "Thou hast tasted of prosperity and and adversity. Thou knowest what it is to be banished thy native country, to be overruled as well as to rule, and to sit upon the throne; and being oppressed, thou hast reason to know how hateful oppression is both to God and man. If after all these warnings and adver tisements thou dost not turn unto the Lord with all thy heart, but forget Him, who remembered thee in distress, and give up thy self to follow lust and vanity, surely great will be thy condemnation."

And this courage to dare to say what they believe to be right, as it was an eminent feature in the character of the primitive, so it is unquestionably a trait in that of the modern members. They use no flattery even in the presence of the King; and when the nation has addressed him in favor of new wars, they have sometimes had the conrage to oppose the national voice on such an occasion, and to go before the same great personage, and in a respectful and dignified manner to deliver a religious petition against the shedding of human blood.

They have the courage also to dare to do, as well as to say, what they consider to be right.

It is recorded of the early Quakers, that in the times of the hottest persecution they stood to their testimony in the places appointed for their worship. They never assembled in private rooms, or held private conventicles, employing persons to watch at the doors to keep out spies and informers, or to prevent surprise from the magistrates; but they worshiped always in public, and with their doors open: nor when armed men were sent to dissolve their meetings did they ever

fly; but, on the summons to break up and depart, they sat motionless; and, regardless of threats and blows, never left their devotions, but were obliged to be dragged out one by one from their places. And even where their meeting-houses were totally destroyed by the magistrates, they sometimes met the next meeting-day and worshipped publicly on the ruins, notwithstanding they knew that they were subject by so doing to fines, and scourges, and confinements, and banishments; and that, like many others of their members, who had been persecuted, they might die in prison.

This courage of the primitive members has descended, as far as circumstances will allow us to judge, to their posterity, or to those, who profess the same faith. For happily, on account of the superior knowledge, which has been diffused among us since those times, and on account of the progress of the benign influence of Christianity, both of which may be supposed to have produced among the members of our legislature a spirit of liberality in religion, neither the same trials, nor the same number of them, can be afforded for the courage of the modern Quakers, as were afforded for that of their predecessors. But as far as there are trials, the former exhibit courage proportioned to their weight. This has been already conspicuous in the bearing of their testimony, either in those cases where they run the hazard of suffering by opposing the customs of the world, or where, by refusing a compliance with legal demands, which they believe to be antichristian, they actually suffer. Nor are these sufferings often slight, when we consider that they may be made, even in these days of toleration, to consist of confinement, as the law now stands, for years, and it may happen even for life, in prison.

This feature of courage in life, which has been attached to the character of the Society, is the genuine offspring of the trait of "The bearing of their Testimony." For by their testimony it becomes their religion to suffer, rather than comply with many of the laws and customs of the land. But every time they get through their sufferings, if they suffer conscientiously, they gain a victory, which gives them courage to look other sufferings in the face, and to bid defiance to other persecutions.

This feature is generated, again, by all those circumstances, which have been enumerated, as producing the quality of independence of mind; and it is promoted, again, by the peculiar customs of the Society. For a Quaker is a singular object among his countrymen. His dress, his language, and his customs mark him. One person looks at him. Another, perhaps, derides him. He must summon resolution, or he cannot stir out of doors and be comfortable. Resolution, once summoned, begets resolution again, till at length he

acquires habits superior to the looks, and frowns, and ridicule of the world.

SECTION II.

The trait of courage includes also Courage in Death—this trait probable—from the lives which the Quakers lead—and from circumstances connected with their religious faith.

This quality of courage includes also courage in death; or it belongs to the character of the individuals of this community that they show great indifference with respect to death, or that they possess great intrepidity when sensible of the approach of it.

I shall do no more on this subject than state what may be the causes of this trait.

The thought of the dissolution of all our vital organs, and of the cessation to be, so that we move no longer upon the face of the earth, and that our places know us no more; or the idea of being swept away suddenly into eternal oblivion, and of being as though we had never been, cannot fail of itself to produce awful sensations upon our minds. But still more awful wlil these be, where men believe in a future state; and where, believing in future rewards and punishments, they contemplate what may be their allotment in eternity. There are considerations, however, which have been found to support men even under these awful reflections, and to enable them to meet with intrepidity their approaching end.

It may certainly be admitted, that in proportion as we cling to the things of the world, we shall be less willing to leave them; which may induce an appearance of fear with respect to departing out of life; and that, in proportion as we deny the world and its pleasures, or mortify the affections of the flesh, we shall be more willing to exchange our earthly for spiritual enjoyments; which may induce an appearance of courage with respect to death.

It may be admitted, again, that in proportion as we have filled our moral stations in life—that is, as we have done justly, and loved mercy, and this not only with respect to our fellow-creature man, but to the different creatures of God—there will be a conscious rectitude within us, which will supply us with courage when we believe ourselves called upon to leave them.

It may be admitted, again, that in proportion as we have endeavored to follow the Divine commands as contained in the Sacred Writings, and as we have followed these, through faith, fearless of the opinions and persecutions of men, so as to have become sufferers for the Truth, we shall have less fear, or more courage, when we suppose the hour of our dissolution to be approaching.

Now, without making any invidious comparisons, I think it will follow from hence, when we consider the Quakers to be persons of acknowledged moral character; when we know that they deny themselves for the sake of becoming purer beings, the ordinary pleasures and gratifications of the world; and when almost daily experience testifies to us that they prefer bearing their testimony, or suffering as a Christian body, to a compliance with customs which they conceive the Christian religion to disapprove—that they will have as fair pretensions to courage in the hour of death as any other people, as a body, from the same causes.

There are other circumstances, however, which may be taken into consideration in this account; and, in looking over these, I find none of more importance than those, which relate to the religious creeds, which may be professed by individuals or communities of men.

Much, in the first place, will depend upon the circumstances, how far men are doubtful and wavering in their creeds; or how far they depend upon others for their faith; or how far, in consequence of reasoning or feeling, they depend upon themselves. If their creeds are not in their own power, they will be liable to be troubled with every wind of doctrine that blows, and to be unhappy when the thought of their dissolution is brought before them. But the Quakers having broken the power or dominion of the priesthood, what terrors can fanaticism hold out to them, which shall appal their courage in their latter hours?

It is also of great importance to men, what may be the nature of their creeds. Some creeds are unquestionably more comfortable to the mind than others. To those, who believe in the doctrine of Election and Reprobation, and imagine themselves to be of the Elect, no creed can give greater courage in the hour of death; and to those, who either doubt or despair of their election, none can inspire more fear. But the Quakers, on the other hand, encourage encourage the doctrine of Perfection, or that all may do the will of God if they attend to the monitions of his grace. They believe that God is good, and just, and merciful; that he visits all, with a view to this perfection, without exception of persons, that he enables all, through the sacrifice of Christ, to be saved; and that he will make an allowance for all according to his attributes; for that he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should inherit eternal life.

CHAPTER IX.

Last good trait is that of Punctuality to Words and Engagements—this probable from the operations of all those principles which have produced for the Quakers the character of a moral people—and from the operation of their discipline.

The last good quality, which I shall notice in the character of the Quakers, is that of Punctuality to their Words and Engagements.

This is a very ancient trait. Judge Forster entertained this opinion of George Fox—that, if he would consent to give his word for his appearance, he would keep it. Trusted to go at large without any bail, and solely on his bare word that he would be forthcoming on a given day, he never violated his promise. And he was known also to carry his own commitment himself. In those days, also, it was not unusual for Quakers to carry their own warrants, unaccompanied by constables or others, which were to consign them to a prison.

But it was not only in matters which related to the laws of the land, where the primitive members held their words and engagements sacred. This trait was remarked to be true of them in their concerns in trade. On their first appearance as a Society they suffered as tradesmen, because others, displeased with the peculiarity of their manners, withdrew their custom from their shops. But in a little time the great outcry against them was, that they got the trade of the country into their hands. This outcry arose in part from a strict execution of all commercial appointments and agreements between them and others, and because they never asked two prices for the commodities, which they sold. And the same character attaches to them as a commercial body, though there may be individual exceptions, at the present day.

Neither has this trait been confined to them as the inhabitants of their own country. They have carried it with them wherever they have gone. The treaty of William Penn was never violated: and the estimation, which the Indians put upon the word of this great man and his companions, continues to be put by them upon that of the modern Quakers in America; so that they now come in deputations out of their own settlements to consult them on important occasions.

The existence of this feature is probable, both from general and from particular considerations.

If, for example, any number of principles should have acted so forcibly and in such a manner upon individuals as to have procured

for them as a body the reputation of a moral people, they must have produced in them a disposition to keep their faith*.

But the discipline of the Society has a direct tendency to produce this feature in their character, and to make it an appendage of Quakerism. For, punctuality to words and engagements is a subject of one of the periodical inquiries. It is therefore publicly handed to the notice of the members, in their public meetings for discipline, as a Christian virtue that is expected of them. And any violation in this respect would be deemed a breach, and cognisable as such, of the Quaker-laws.

CHAPTER X.

Imperfect traits in the Quaker-character—some of these may be called intellectually defective traits—first imputation of this kind is, that the Quakers are deficient in learning, compared with other people—this trait not improbable, on account of their early devotion to trade—and on account of their controversies and notions about human learning—and from other causes.

The world, while it has given to the Quakers as a body, as it has now appeared, a more than ordinary share of virtue, has not been without the belief that there are blemishes in their character. What these blemishes are may be collected partly from books, partly from conversation, and partly from vulgar sayings. They are divisible into two kinds,—into intellectually defective, and into morally defective traits; the former relating to the understanding, the latter to the heart.

The first of the intellectually defective traits consists in the imputation, that the Quakers are deficient in the cultivation of the intellect of their children; or, that when they grow up in life they are found to have less knowledge than others in the higher branches of learning. By this I mean that they are understood to have but a moderate classical education, to know but little of the different branches of philosophy, and to have, upon the whole, less variety of knowledge than others of their countrymen in the corresponding stations of life.

This feature seems to have originated with the world in two supposed facts. The first is, that there has never been any literary writer of eminence born in the Society; Penn, Barclay, and others,

---

* This character was given by Pliny to the first Christians. They were to avoid frauds, theft, and adultery. They were never to deny any trust when required to deliver it up, nor to falsify their word on any occasion.

having come into it by convincement, and brought their learning with them. The second is, that the Society has never yet furnished a philosopher, or produced any material discovery. It is rather a common remark, that if the education of others had been as limited as that of the individuals of this community, we should have been probably at this day without a Newton, and might have been strangers to those great discoveries, whether of the art of navigation, or of the circulation of the blood, or of any other kind, which have proved so eminently useful to the comfort, health, and safety of many of the human race.

This trait will be true, or it will be false, as it is applied to the different classes, which may be found in the Society of the Quakers. The poor, who belong to it, are all taught to read, and therefore better educated than the poor belonging to other bodies of men. They who spring from parents, whose situation does not entitle them to rank with the middle class, but yet keeps them out of the former, are generally educated by the help of a subscription at Ackworth School, and may be said to have more school-learning than others in a similar situation in life*. The rest, whatever may be their situation, are educated wholly at the expense of their parents, who send them either to private Quaker-seminaries, or to schools in the neighborhood, as they judge it to be convenient or proper. It is upon this body of the Quakers that the imputation can only fall; and, as far as these are concerned, I think it may be said with truth that they possess a less portion of what is usually called liberal knowledge, than others in a corresponding station in life. There may be here and there a good classical or a good mathematical scholar: but in general there are but few individuals among them, who excel in these branches of learning. I ought, however, to add, that this character is not likely to remain long with the Society; for the young members of the present day seem to me to be sensible of the inferiority of their own education, and to be making an attempt towards the improvement of their minds, by engaging in those, which are the most entertaining, instructive, and useful;—I mean philosophical pursuits.

That deficiency in literature and science is likely to be a feature in the character of the Society we may pronounce, if we take into consideration circumstances, which have happened, and notions which have prevailed in it.

---

* Their parents pay a small annual sum towards their board and clothing. The rest is made up by a subscription in the Society, and by the funds of the school. The children also of the poor are admitted to this school, but these pay nothing.

The Quakers, like the Jews of old, whether they are rich or poor, are brought up, in obedience to their own laws, to some employment. They are called of course at an early age from their books. It can not therefore be expected of them, that they should possess the same literary character as they, who spend years at our Universities, or whose time is not taken up by the concerns of trade.

It happens also in this Society, that persons of the poor and middle classes are frequently through industry becoming rich. While these were gaining but a moderate support, they gave their children but a moderate education. But when they came into possession of a greater substance, their children had finished their education, having grown up to be men.

The ancient controversy, too, relative to the necessity of human learning as a qualification for ministers of the Gospel, has been detrimental to the promotion of literature and science among them. This controversy was maintained with great warmth and obstinacy on both sides; that is, by the early Quakers, who were men of learning, on the one hand, and by the Divines of our Universities on the other. The less learned in the Society, who read this controversy, did not make the proper distinction concerning it. They were so interested in keeping up the doctrine, "that learning was not necessary for the priesthood," that they seemed to have forgotten that it was necessary at all. Hence knowledge began to be cried down in the Society; and though the proposition was always meant to be true with respect to the priesthood only, yet many mistook or confounded its meaning, so that they gave their children but a limited education on that account.

The opinions also of the Quakers relative to classical authors have been another cause of impeding, in some degree, their progress in learning; that is, in the classical part of it. They believe these to have inculcated a system of morality frequently repugnant to that of the Christian religion. And the Heathen mythology, which is connected with their writings, and which is fabulous throughout, they conceive to have disseminated romantic notions among youth, and to have made them familiar with fictions, to the prejudice of an unshaken devotedness to the love of truth.

CHAPTER XI.

Second trait is, that they are a superstitious people—Circumstances that have given birth to this trait—Quakerism, where it is understood, is seldom chargeable with superstition—where it is misunderstood, it leads to it—Subjects in which it may be misunderstood are those of the province of the Spirit—and of dress and language—Evils to be misapprehended from a misunderstanding of the former subject.

It may seem wonderful, at first sight, that persons, who have discarded an undue veneration for the Saints, and the Saints-days, and the relics of the Roman-catholic religion, who have had the resolution to reject the ceremonials of Protestants, such as Baptism, and the sacrament of the Supper, and who have broken the terrors of the dominion of the priesthood, should, of all others, be chargeable with superstition. But so it is. The world has certainly fixed upon them the character of a superstitious people. Under this epithet much is included. It is understood, that Quakers are more ready than others to receive mystical doctrines, more apt to believe in marvellous appearances, more willing to place virtue in circumstances where many would place imposition; and that, independently of all this, they are more scrupulous with respect to the propriety of their ordinary movements, waiting for religious impulses, when no such impulses are expected by other religious people.

This trait of superstition is an ancient feature in their character, and has arisen from the following causes:

It has been long imagined, that where a people devote themselves so exclusively to the influence of the Spirit as the members of this community appear to do, they will not be sufficiently on their guard to make the proper distinctions between imagination and revelation, and that they will be apt to confound impressions, and to bring the Divine Spirit out of its proper sphere into the ordinary occurrences of their lives. And in this opinion the world considers itself to have been confirmed by an expression, said to have been long in use among them, which is, "that they will do such and such things, if they have liberty to do them." Now by this expression the Quakers may mean only, that all human things are so uncertain, and so many unforseen events may happen, that they dare make no absolute promises, but they will do the things in question if no obstacle should arise to prevent them. And this caution in language runs through the whole Society; for they seldom promise but provisionally in any case. But the world has interpreted the expression differently, and maintains that the Quakers mean by it, that they will do such and

such things, if they feel that they have liberty or permission from the Spirit of God.

Two other circumstances, which have given birth to this feature in the character of the Quakers, are the singularities of their dress and language. For, when these are spoken of by the world, they are usually mentioned under the name of the idolatry or superstition of the Quaker-language, or the idolatry or superstition of the Quaker-dress.

Now this trait, which has originated in the three causes that have been mentioned, is considered by the world to have been still more confirmed by a circumstance which happened but a few years ago: namely, that when animal-magnetism was in fashion, there were more of this Society worked upon by these delusions than of any other.

With respect to the truth of this trait, I believe it cannot easily be made out, as far as animal magnetism is concerned. For although undoubtedly there were Quakers so superstitious as to be led away on this occasion, yet they were very few in number, and not more in proportion than others of other religious denominations. The conduct of these was also considered as reprehensible by the Society at large, and some pains were taken to convince them of their errors, and of the unsuitableness of such doctrines with the religion they professed.

With respect to the truth of this trait, as it may have existed on other occasions, it may be laid down as a position generally true. that where the members understand their own constitution, it can have no place among them. But where they do not understand it. there are few people among whom it is more likely to exist, as we may see from the following account.

It is the doctrine of Quakerism on the subject of the Spirit, that it is an infallible guide to men in their spiritual concerns. But I do not see where it is asserted by any of the Quaker-writers, that it is to be a guide to man in all the temporal concerns of his life, or that he is to depreciate the value of human reason. George Fox was very apprehensive, that even in matters of religion, which constitute the immediate province of the Divine Spirit, men might mistake their own enthusiastic feelings for revelation; and he censured some, to use his own expression, "for having gone out into imaginations." The Society also have been apprehensive of the same consequences. Hence one among other reasons for the institution of the office of Elders. It is the duty of these to watch over the doctrine of the ministers, to see that they preach soundly, and that they do not mistake their own imaginations for the Spirit of God, and mix his

wisdom with the waywardness of their own wills. They, therefore, who believe in the doctrine of the agency of the Spirit, and at the same time in the necessity of great caution and watchfulness that they may not confound its operations with that of their own fancies, will never incur the charge which has been brought against the Body at large. But if there are others, who give themselves up to this agency without the necessary caution, they will gradually mix their impressions, and will in time refer most of them to the same source. They will bring the Divine Being by degrees out of his spiritualp rovince, and introduce him into all the trivial and worthless concerns of their lives. Hence a belief will arise, which cannot fail of binding their minds in the chains of delusion and superstition.

It is the doctrine of Quakerism, again, on the subject of dress, that plainness and simplicity are required of those, who profess the Christian character; that any deviation from these is unwarrantable, if it be made on the plea of conformity to the fashion of the world; that such deviation bespeaks the beginning of an unstable mind; and, if not noticed, may lead into many evils. They, therefore, who consider dress in this point of view, will never fall into any errors of mind in their contemplation of this subject. But if there are members, on the other hand, who place virtue in the color and shape of their clothing, as some of the Jews did in the broad phylacteries on their garments, they will place it in lifeless appearances and forms, and bring their minds under vassalage to a false religion. And in the same manner it may be observed with respect to language, that if persons in the Society lay an undue stress upon it, that is, if they believe truth or falsehood to exist inherently in lifeless words, and this contrary to the sense in which they know they will be understood by the world, so that they dare not pronounce them for religion's sake, they will be in danger of placing religion where it is not, and of falling into errors concerning it, which will with reason be denominated superstition by the world.

As I am now on the subject of superstition, as capable of arising from the three causes that have been mentioned, I shall dwell for a short time on some of the evils, which may arise from one of them, or from a misunderstanding of the doctrine of the agency of the Spirit.

I believe it possible, in the first place, for those, who receive this doctrine without the proper limitations, that is, for those, who attribute everything exclusively to the Spirit of God, and who draw no line between revelation and the suggestions of their own will, to be guilty of evil actions, and to make the Divine Being the author of them all.

I have no doubt, for example, that many of those, who engaged in the Crusades, considered themselves as led into them by the Spirit of God. But what true Quaker, in these days, would wish to make the Almighty the author of all the bloodshed in the wars that were undertaken on this account?

The same may be said with respect to martyrdoms. For there is reason to believe that many, who were instrumental in shedding the blood of their fellow creatures because they happened to differ from them in religious opinion, conceived that they were actuated by the Divine Spirit, and that they were doing God service, and aiding the cause of religion, by their conduct on such occasions. But what true Quaker would believe, that the Father of justice and mercy was the author of these bloody persecutions; or that, if men were now to feel an impulse in their own minds to any particular action, they ought to obey it, if it were to lead them to do evil that good might come?

The same may be said with respect to many of the bad laws, which are to be found in the codes of the different nations of the world. Legislators, no doubt, have often thought themselves spiritually guided when they made them. And judges, who have been remarkable for appealing to the Divine Spirit in the course of their lives, have made no hesitation to execute them. This was particularly the case with Sir Matthew Hale. If there be any one, whose writings speak a more than ordinary belief in the agency of the Spirit of God, it is this great and estimable man. This Spirit he consulted, not only in the spiritual but in the temporal concerns of his life. And yet he sentenced to death a number of persons, because they were reputed to be witches. But what true Quaker believes in witchcraft? or does he not rather believe, that the Spirit of God, if rightly understood, would have protested against condemnation for a crime, which does not exist?

But the mischief, if a proper distinction is not made between the agency of the Spirit and that of the will of man, may spread further, and may reach the man himself, and become injurious to his health, his intellect, and his usefulness; and the Divine Being may be made again the author of it all.

Many, we all know, notwithstanding their care and attention, have found that they have gone wrong in their affairs in various instances of their lives; that is, events have shown that they have taken a wrong course. But if there be those, who suppose themselves in these instances to have been acted upon by the Spirit of God, what is more likely, than that they may imagine that they have lost his favor; and that, looking upon themselves as driven by him into the wrong road, they may fall into the belief that they are among the

condemned reprobate, and pine away, deprived of their senses, in a state of irretrievable misery and despair?

Others again may injure their health, and diminish their comfort and their utility, in another way. And here I may remark, that, if I have seen what the world would call superstition among the Quakers, it has been confined principally to a few females, upon whose constitution, more delicate than that of men, an attention to undistinguished impressions, brought on in a course of time by a gradual depreciation of human reason, has acted with considerable force. I fear that some of these, in the upright intentions of their hearts to consult the Almighty on all occasions as the sole arbiter of everything that is good, have fostered their own infirmities, and gone into retirements so frequent, as to have occasioned these to interfere with the duties of domestic comfort and social good; and that they have been at last so perplexed with an increasing multitude of doubts and scruples, that they have been afraid of doing many trivial things, because they have not had a revelation for them. The state of such worthy persons is much to be pitied. What must be their feelings under such a conflict, when they are deserted by human reason! What an effect will not such religious doubts and perplexities have upon their health! What impediments do they not throw in the way of their own utility!

I should be sorry, if by any observations, such as the preceding, I should be thought to censure any one for the morality of his feelings. And still more sorry should I be, if I were to be thought to have any intention of derogating from the character of the Supreme Being. I am far from denying his omniscience; for I believe that he sees every sparrow that falls to the ground, and even more, that he knows the innermost thoughts of men. I deny not his omnipresence; for I believe that he may be seen in all his works. I deny neither his general nor his particular providence, nor his hearing of our prayers, nor his right direction in our spiritual concerns, nor his making all things work together for good to those, who love him. Neither do I refuse to admit him either into our journeys, or into our walks, or into our chambers; for he can make all the things we see subservient to our moral instruction, and his own glory. But I should be sorry to have him considered as a clock, that is to inform us about the times of our ordinary movements; or to make him a prompter in all our worldly concerns; or to oblige him to take his seat in animal magnetism; or to reside in the midst of marvellous delusions. Why should we expect a revelation in the most trivial concerns in our lives, where our reason will inform us? Why, like the waggoner, apply to Hercules, when we may remove the difficulty by

putting our own shoulders to the wheels? If we are reasonable creatures, we can generally tell whether we ought to go forwards or backwards, or to begin or to postpone; whether our actions are likely to be innocent or hurtful, or whether we are going on an errand of benevolence or of evil. In fact, there can be no necessity for this constant appeal to the Spirit in* all our wordly concerns, while we possess our reason as men. And unless some distinction be made between the real agency of God and our own volitions, which distinction true Quakerism suggests, we shall be liable to be tossed to and fro by every wind that blows, and to become the creatures of a superstition, that may lead us into great public evils, while it may be injurious to our health and intellect, and to the happiness and utility of our lives.

CHAPTER XII.

Morally defective traits—First of these is that of Obstinacy—this was attached also to the early Christians—No just foundation for the existence of this trait.

I come now to the consideration of those, which I have denominated Morally Defective Traits.

The first of this kind, which is attached to the character of the Quakers, is that of an obstinate spirit.

This trait is a very ancient one. It was observed, in the time of George Fox, of the members of this Society, that they were as "stiff as trees;" and this idea concerning them has come down to the present day.

The origin of this defective feature must be obvious to all. The Quakers, as we have seen, will neither pay tithes, nor perform military service, nor illuminate their houses, like other people, though they are sure of suffering by their refusal to comply with custom in these cases. Now, when individuals, few in number, become singular, and differ from the world at large, it is generally considered that the majority are in the right, and that the minority are in the wrong. But obstinacy may be defined to be a perseverance in that, which is generally considered to be wrong.

This epithet has attached, and will attach, to those, who resist the popular opinion, till men are better educated, or till they lose their

---

* I hope the reader will consider me as confining my observations on this subject to trivial things. I by no means intend to say, that we ought never to ask help or directions of the Almighty, or that when we put our shoulders to the wheel, we should not look up to Him for a blessing on our exertions.

prejudices, or have more correct and liberal notions on religion. The early Christians were themselves accused of obstinacy, and this even by the enlightened Pliny. He tells us that they would not use wine and frankincense before the statues of the emperors, and that "there was no question that for such obstinacy they deserved punishment*."

In judging of the truth of this trait, two questions will arise: First, Whether the members of this Society, in adhering rigidly to those singularities, which have produced it, are really wrong as a body of Christians? and, secondly, Whether they do not conscientiously believe themselves to be right?

In the case of the early Christians, which has been mentioned, we, who live at this day, have no doubt that Pliny put a false estimate on their character. We believe them to have done their duty, and we believe also that they considered themselves as doing it, when they refused divine honors to the emperors. The action, therefore, which Pliny denominated obstinacy, would, if it had been left to us to name it, have been called inflexible virtue, as arising out of a sense of the obligations imposed upon them by the Christian religion.

In the same manner we may argue with respect to the Quakers. Who, for example, if he will try to divest himself of the prejudices of custom, and of the policy of the world, feels such a consciousness of his own powers, as positively to pronounce that the notions of the Quakers are utterly false as to the illicitness of wars under the Christian system? Their arguments on this subject are quite as good, in my apprehension, as any that I have heard advanced on the other side of the question. These arguments, too, are unquestionably much more honorable to Christianity, and much more consistent with the nature and design of the Gospel-dispensation. They are supported also by the belief and the practice of the earliest Christians. They are arguments, again, which have suggested themselves to many good men who were not of this Society, and which have occasioned doubts in some instances, and conviction in others, against the prejudice of education and the dominion of custom. And if the event should ever come to pass, which most Christians expect, that men will one day or other turn their swords and their spears into plough-shares and pruning-hooks; they, who live in that day, will applaud the perseverance of the Quakers in this case, and weep over the obstinacy and inconsistency of those, who combated their opinions.

But the question after all is, Whether the Quakers believe themselves in this, or in any other of their religious scruples, to be right

* "Pervicaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri."

as a Christian body? If there are those among them, who do not, these give into the customs of the world, and either leave the Society themselves, or become disowned. It is therefore only a fair and a just presumption, that all those, who continue in the Society, and who keep up to these scruples to the detriment of their worldly interest, believe themselves to be right. But this belief of their own rectitude, even if they should happen to be wrong, is religion to them, and ought to be estimated so by us in matters, in which an interpretation of Gospel-principles is concerned. This is but an homage due to conscience, after all the blood that has been shed in the course of Christian persecutions, and after all the religious light that has been diffused among us since the reformation of our religion.

CHAPTER XIII.

SECTION I.

Next trait is that of the Money-getting Spirit—Probability of the truth of this trait examined—An undue eagerness after money not unlikely to be often the result of the frugal and commercial habits of the Society—but not to the extent insisted on by the world—This eagerness, wherever it exists, seldom chargeable with avarice.

The next defective feature in the character of the members of this Society, is that of a Money-getting Spirit, or of a devotedness to the acquisition of money in their several callings and concerns.

This character is considered as belonging so generally to the individuals of this Society, that it is held by the world to be almost inseparable from Quakerism. A certain writer has remarked, that they follow their concerns in pursuit of riches, "with a step as steady as time, and with an appetite as keen as death."

I do not know what circumstances have given birth to this feature. That the Quakers are a thriving set, we know. That they may also appear, when known to be a domestic people and to have discarded the amusements of the world, to be more in their shops and counting-houses than others, is probable. And it is not unlikely, that, in consequence of this appearance, connected with this worldly prosperity, they may be thought to be more intent than others upon the promotion of their pecuniary concerns. There are circumstances, however, belonging to the character and customs of the Society, which would lead to an opposite conclusion. They are acknowledged, in the first place, to be a charitable people. But, if so, they

ought not to be charged, at least, with that species of the money-getting spirit, which amounts to avarice. It is also an undoubted fact, that they give up no small portion of their time, and put themselves to no small expense, on account of their religion. In country places, they allot one morning in the week, and in some of the towns two, besides the Sunday, to their religious worship. They have also their monthly meetings, and, after these, their quarterly, to attend, on account of their discipline. And this they do frequently at a great distance, and after a considerable absence, as tradesmen, from their homes. I do not mean to insinuate by this latter instance, that men become pious, and therefore proof against the influence of money, exactly in proportion as they attend their religious meetings; but that, where they are voraciously intent upon the getting of money, they could hardly be expected to make such a sacrifice of their time.

But whatever may be the appearances on either side, the question is, Whether the imputation of the trait, which is now under our consideration, be founded in fact. What circumstances make in favor of it. What circumstances make against it. And, which of these preponderate on the whole.

We may say then, at the first sight, that the precepts of Quakerism make decidedly against it. And we may say again, that it ought to be expected, that all those principles and circumstances, which have an influence in the production of moral character, or of such a character as belongs to the members of this community, should work together, in some degree, either towards its prevention, or its cure.

On the other hand, if we examine the situation of the Society, we shall find circumstances, the operation of which is directly in favor of such a trait.

And first, in looking into the human heart, we seem to discover a circumstance, which, on account of the situation alluded to, may operate as a spring in producing it. Men, generally speaking, love consequence. Now the Quakers, though they have consequence in their own Society, have none in the world. They can neither be legislators nor magistrates. They can take no titles to distinguish them. They pass therefore in the world, like the common and undistinguished herd, except from the peculiarities of their dress. But riches give all men consequence. And it is not clear to me, but that this circumstance may have its operation on the minds of some, who are called Quakers, in contributing to the production of the money-getting spirit, inasmuch as it may procure them a portion of estimation which they cannot otherwise have while they remain in their own body.

In looking again into the human heart, we find another, and this a powerful spring, connected with the situation of the members of this community, for the production of such a trait.

The Quakers, as I have observed before, are mostly in trade. Now they are generally a sedate, thoughtful, sober, diligent, and honest people. It is not then too much to say, with these qualifications, that they will be as successful in trade as others. Hence their incomes will be as great in proportion to their capitals, as those of others from the same source.

But let us look for a moment at their outgoings. They neither spend nor lose their money at cards, or at horse-races, or by any other species of gaming. They do not waste their substance either in drinking at taverns or at home. Not having in general an enlarged education, or a taste for literature, they have no expensive libraries. They buy no costly paintings. They neither powder their hair, nor dress in a splendid manner. They use no extravagant furniture. They keep no packs of hounds for their diversion. They are never seen at the theatres. They have neither routs, balls, nor music-meetings. They have neither expensive liveries nor equipages. Hence it must follow, that their outgoings, as far as their living is concerned, cannot in general be as great as those of others in a similar condition of life.

But if their inlets are greater than their outlets of money, when compared with those of other persons, a greater overplus of money beyond the expenses of living will be the constant result; or there will be a greater increasing accumulation of money upon the whole, than falls within the possession of others. Now a question arises here, founded on a knowledge of the infirmities of our nature. Are men likely in general, constituted as they are, to see the golden idol constantly rising in dimension before them, and to refrain from worshipping it? or are they likely to see it without a corruption of their moral vision? It is observed* by one of the Scriptural writers, "A merchent shall hardly keep himself from doing wrong, and a huckster shall not be free from sin." And where is it that this old saying, except the mind be strongly fortified by religion, will not be found equally true in the present as in former times? The truth is, that the old maxim,

"Crescit amor nummi quantum, ipsa pecunia crescit,"

is a just one. That is, it is true "that the coming in of money in an undue proportion begets the love of it;" that the love of money

* Eccl. xxvi. 29.

again leads to the getting of more; that the getting of more again generally increases the former love. And hence a round is kept up of circumstances and feelings, till a money-getting spirit creeps into the character of him, who is placed in a situation so unfortunate for the purity of his heart.

These then are the acting and the counteracting circumstances on both sides. Which of the two are likely to be predominant, we must conjecture. Where men have become full grown Quakers, the latter will lose their power. But where they have not (and it is to be presumed that there are many in the Society who have not reached this stature, and many again who bear only the name of their profession) they will frequently prevail. I own I fear that precepts, though there may be a general moral bias, will not always be found successful against those, which are considered to be the most powerful of the temptations, to which our nature is exposed. I own, when I consider that the Quakers, in consequeuce of their commercial and frugal habits, have greater pecuniary accumulatlons before their eyes than others in a similar condition of life; when I consider how few are able to bear these accumulations without moral injury to themselves; and that even the early Christians began to relax in their character when they began to be prosperous; I am of opinion that there is some foundation for the existence of such a spirit, though not to the extent insisted on by the world; or that there is in the Society, notwithstanding the many bright and amiable exceptions that are to be found in it, a greater eagerness after wealth than is consistent with its religious profession. And to this opinion I am inclined from another consideration, which cannot be overlooked in the present case. The Book of Extracts itself acknowledges the existence of such a spirit; for it characterizes it under the name of "hastening to be rich," and it calls it "a growing evil."

But when I say that I so far accede to the opinion of the world, as to allow that the money-getting spirit may be fixed upon a part of the Society, I feel that I ought to make a proper distinction concerning it. I must observe, that the money-getting spirit, wherever it may be chargeable upon its members, seldom belongs to that species, which is called avarice. It is by no means incongruous to suppose, that there may be in the same person an unreasonable love of money, and yet a show of benevolence. The money-getting spirit will have a different effect, as it operates upon different persons. Upon those, who have been brought up in an ignorant and unfeeling manner, it will operate to make them hoard their substance, and to keep it exclusively to themselves. But it will not always hinder those, who have been humanely educated, though it may lead them

to unreasonable accumulations, from dispensing a portion of their gains. In the first instance it is highly criminal, because it keeps the whole of its talent in a napkin. In the second, though less criminal, it is greatly to be deplored, but more particularly in a Quaker, who, making a higher profession of Christianity than many others, ought to give to the world the example of a purer mind.

SECTION II.

Further observations on the subject of the former trait—practicable methods suggested for its extirpation—these methods not destructive, but promotive, of the temporal interests of the members of this Society—and consistent with the religion they profess.

As the Quakers appear to me, in consequence of their commercial and frugal habits, to be in danger of contracting a money-getting spirit, and as this spirit is, as I conceive, the worst feature that can exist in their character, I shall allot a few pages to the further consideration of the subject, with a view to the prevention of such an evil.

That it is the worst feature that can exist in the character of the Society, I repeat. It is worse than a want of knowledge, or than superstition, because these relate to the understanding, while this is confined to the heart. It renders the system of the moral education of the Society almost nugatory. For, what is the use of keeping the mind in a state of spiritual purity by means of prohibitions, or by attempting to shut it out from the knowledge of corruptive amusements, if it be afterwards to be rendered impure by the love of money? It occasions them, again, to bear their testimony as it were against their own religion. For a Quaker is not in the situation of an ordinary person. He looks upon himself as a highly professing Christian; as one who is not to conform to the fashions of the world; as one who is to lead a life of self-denial; as one who is to go forward in virtue,—his belief being that of a possibility of perfection even in the present life. He considers himself, too, as a representative of the early Christians, and holds himself ready to follow them, by the bearing of his testimony, into suffering, and even unto death. But what Christian can harbor a money-getting spirit, or be concerned in an extensive accumulation of wealth? If a Quaker therefore should go into the common road, and fall down before the idol Mammon like any other ordinary person, how can the world give him any pretension but to an ordinary religion?

My object in the present consideration of the subject will be to show the Quakers in general, and those in particular who may need it, some practicable cure for this evil, and to convince them that the

mode of effecting it will not be detrimental to the temporal interests of their families, but promotive of their spiritual, and consistent with the religion they profess.

The first method, which I would recommend to those, who are in trade, and who know their own habits of life and the extent of their families, would be to fix upon a certain sum, which they may think sufficient for a future descent and moderate competency, and to leave off business as soon as this should be obtained. Such a step would be useful. It would be making room for others to live as well as themselves. It would be honorable, for it would be generous. And it would operate as a certain preventive of the money-getting spirit, as well as of the imputation of it. For if such a retreat from trade were laid down, and known as a general custom of the Society, they might bid their hearts rise in defiance against the corruptions of money, and their reputation against the clamors of the world.

This step, hard and difficult as it may appear to those, who are thriving in the world, is, notwithstanding, not a novel one, if we may judge either by the example of many of the pure-minded Christians of other denominations, or by that of many estimable persons in this Society. John Woolman, among many others, was uneasy on account of his business "growing cumbersome," for so he expresses it, lest it should hurt the purity of his mind. And he contracted it, leaving himself only enough of it, and this by the labor of his own hands, for a decent support. And here I might mention other individuals of this Society, if I had no objection to offend the living by praise, who, following his example, have retired upon only a moderate competency, though in the way of great accumulations, for no other reason than because they were afraid lest such accumulations should interfere with their duty, or injure their character as Christians.

But if this measure should not be approved of, under an idea that men ought to have employment for their time, or that, in these days of increasing taxes and of progressively expensive living, they can not specify the sum that may be sufficient for their future wants,—I have another to propose, in consequence of which they may still follow their commercial pursuits, and avoid the imputation in question. I mean that they ought to make it a rule, after the annual expenses of living have been settled, to lay by but small savings. They ought never to accustom their eyes to behold an undue accumulation of money, but liberally to deal it out in charity to the poor and afflicted, in proportion to their gains; thus making their occupations a blessing to mankind. No other measure will be effectual but this, if the former be not resolved upon, while they continue in trade.

Their ordinary charity, it is clear, will not do. Large as it may have been, it has not been found large enough to prove a corrective of this spirit in the opinion of the world. Indeed it matters not how large a charitable donation may seem, if we view it either as a check upon this spirit or as an act of merit, but how large it is, when compared with the bulk of the savings that are left. A hundred pounds given away annually in benevolence may appear something, and may sound handsomely in the ears of the public. But if this sum be taken from the savings of two thousand, it will be little less than a reproach to the donor as a Christian. In short, no other way than the estimation of the gift by the surplus saving will do in the case in question. But this would certainly be effectual to the end proposed. It would entirely keep down the money-getting spirit. It would also do away the imputation of it in the public mind. For it is impossible, in this case, that the word Quakerism should not become synonymous with charity, as it ought to be, if it be a more than ordinary profession of the Christian religion.

Now these methods are not chimerical, but practicable. There can be no reasonable objection against them, because they allow of the acquisition of a decent and moderate competency. The only one that can be started will be, that Quakers may injure the temporal interests of their children, or that they cannot, upon this plan, leave them independent at their deaths.

That independence for children is the general aim of the world, I know well. But I know also, in reply to this objection, that Christianity has no such word as independence in her book. For, of what do people wish to make their children independent? Certainly not of Providence, for that would be insanity indeed. Of the poor, then, shall I say? That is impossible, for how could they get their daily bread? Of the rich, then, like themselves? That would be folly; for where would they form their friendships or their connubial connections, in which they must place a portion of the happiness of their lives? Do they wish, then, to make them independent of society at large, so as not to do it good? That is against all religion. In short, it is impossible, while we exist in this life, to be independent one of another. We are bound by Christianity in one great chain, every link of which is to support the next, or the band is broken. But if they mean, by independence, such a moneyed situation as shall place their children out of the reach of the frowns, and crosses, and vicissitudes of the world, so that no thought or care shall be necessary for the means of their own livelihood, I fear they are procuring a situation for them, which will be injurious even to their temporal interests as men.

The matter, then, seems to be brought to this question, Whether is it better, I mean as a general proposition, to bring up children with the expectation of such a moderate portion of wealth, that they shall see the necessity of relying upon their own honest endeavors and the divine support, or to bring them up with such notions of independence, that, in the pride and exultation of their hearts, they may be induced to count themselves mighty, and to lose sight of the power and providence of God?

If we were to look into the world for an answer to this question, we should find no greater calamity than that of leaving to children an affluent independence. Such persons, when grown up, instead of becoming a blessing, are generally less useful than others. They are frequently proud and haughty. Fancying themselves omnipotent, they bid defiance to the opinions of the virtuous part of the community. To the laws of honor and fashion they pay a precise obedience, but trample under foot, as of little consequence, the precepts of the Christian religion. Having sensual gratifications in their power, they indulge to excess. By degrees they ruin their health and fortunes, and get wisdom by experience when it is too late to use it. How many young persons have I known—I wish I could make a different statement—whose ruin originated wholly in a sense of their own independence of the world!

Neither, if we look into the Society of the Quakers, shall we find a different result. It is undoubtedly true, though there are many amiable exceptions, that the worst examples in it are generally among the children of the rich. These presently take wings and fly away; so that, falling into the corruptive and destructive fashions of the times, their parents have only been heaping up riches, not knowing who were to gather them. And here it may be remarked, that the Quaker-education, by means of its prohibitions, greatly disqualifies its young members, who may desert from the Society, from acting prudently afterwards. They will be, in general, but children and novices in the world. Kept within bounds till this period, what is more probable, than that, when they break out of them, they will launch into excess? A great river may be kept in its course by paying constant attention to its banks; but if you make a breach in these restrictive walls, you let it loose, and it deluges the plains below.

In short, whether we turn our eyes to the Quaker-Society, or to the world at large, we cannot consider an affluent independence as among the temporal advantages of youth. And as they, who only leave their children a moderate portion of substance, so that they shall see the necessity of relying upon their own honest endeavors

and the Divine support, act wisely in their own generation, so they act only consistently with the religion they profess. For, what does the religion of the Quakers hold out to them as the best attainment in life? Is it not spiritual knowledge? Is it not that knowledge, which shall fit them best for the service of their Maker? But such knowledge is utterly unattainable while a money-getting spirit exists; for it has been declared by the highest authority, that we can not serve God and Mammon.

CHAPTER XIV.

Another trait is that of a Want of Animation or Affection—this an appearance only, and no reality, arising from a proper subjugation of the passions—from the prohibitions relative to dress—and address—and the amusements of the world.

It is said next of the members of this Society, that they are a cold and inanimate people, and that they have neither the ordinary affection, nor the gradation of affection, of other people.

I may immediately pronounce upon this trait, that it is merely an outward appearance. The Quakers have as warm feelings as the rest of their countrymen. Their love of their fellow-creatures, more conspicuous in them than in many others, as has been amply shown, gives them a claim to the possession of warm and affectionate feelings. They have the character also of a domestic people; but surely, if they do not possess affection, and this in a very high degree, they must have miserable homes, There is indeed a want of gradation in their affections, which may be traced upon some occasions. In making their wills, for example, they are not apt to raise up an eldest son to the detriment of the rest of their offspring. And this certainly is a proof, that they do not possess the gradation of affection of many other people. Happy it is for their own feelings, and the welfare of their families, that they give this proof to the world of this equal affection for their children.

That this feature is only an appearance, and not a reality, I shall show by stating many outward circumstances in the Quaker-constitution, which may be preventive of apparent animation, but which can have no influence on the heart.

We must all of us be sensible, that both opinions and customs have an effect on the warmth or coldness of our characters. Who would expect, if two faithful portraits could have been handed down to us

from antiquity, to find the same gravity or coldness of countenance and manners in an Athenian as in a Spartan? And, in the same manner, who can expect that there will not be a difference in the appearance of Quakers and other people?

The truth is, that the discipline and education of the Society produce an appearance of a want of animation, and this outward appearance the world has falsely taken as a symbol of the character of the heart. Can we expect that a due subjugation of the passions, which is insisted upon in true Quaker-families, will give either warmth to the countenance, or spirit to the outward manners? Do not the passions animate and give a tone to the characters of men? Can we see, then, the same variety of expression in the faces of the individuals now under our consideration as in those of others on this account? The actions of men, again, enliven their outward appearances; but Quakers, being forbidden to use the address of the world, can assume no variety of action in their intercourse with others. The amusements, again, of the world, such as of music and the theatre, reach the mind, and, animating it, give a certain expression to the countenance; and the contemplation upon these amusements afterwards produces a similar though a slighter effect. But in what Quakers can you see sensibility from the same cause? The dress too of the members of this Society gives them an appearance of gravity and dulness. It makes them also shy of their fellow-citizens. But gravity, and dulness, and shyness, have generally, each of them, the appearance of coldness of manners.

CHAPTER XV.

Another trait is that of Evasiveness in Speech—this an appearance only, arising from a peculiar regard to truth—and from a caution about the proper use of words, induced by circumstances in the discipliue, and by the peculiarities in the Quaker-language.

It is alleged against the members of this Society, as another bad feature in their character, that they are not plain and direct, but that they are evasive in their answers to any questions that may be asked them.

There is no doubt that the world, who know scarcely any thing about the Quakers, will have some reason, if they judge from their outward manner of expression, to come to such a conclusion. There is often a sort of hesitation in their speech, which has the appear-

ance of evasiveness. But though there may be such an appearance, their answers to questions are full and accurate when finally given; and unquestionably there is no intention in them either to hold back any thing, or to deceive.

This outward appearance, strange to relate, arises in part from an amiable trait in their character! Their great desire to speak the truth, and not to exceed it, occasions often a sort of doubtfulness of speech. It occasions them also, instead of answering a question immediately, to ask other questions, that they may see the true bearings of the thing intended to be known. The same appearance of doubt runs also through the whole Society in all those words, which relate to promises, from the same cause; for the Quakers, knowing the uncertainty of all human things, and the impossibility of fulfilling but provisionally, seldom, as I have observed before, promise any thing positively, that they may not come short of the truth. The desire, therefore, of uttering the truth has in part brought this accusation upon their heads.

Other circumstances also, to be found within the constitution of the Society, have a tendency to produce the same effect.

In their monthly, and quarterly, and yearly meetings for discipline, they are taught by custom to watch the propriety of the expressions that are used in the wording of their minutes, that these may accurately represent the sense of the persons present. And this habit of caution about the use of words, in the affairs of their own Society, naturally begets a caution concerning it also in their intercourse with the world.

The peculiarities of their language produce also a similar circumspection. For, where people are restrained from the use of expressions, which are generally adopted by others; and this on the belief, that, as a highly professing people, they ought to be watchful over their words as well as their actions, a sort of hesitation will accompany them, or a pause will be perceptible, while they are choosing as it were the proper words for a reply to any of the questions that may be asked them.

CHAPTER XVI.

Another trait is that of Slyness—this is an appearance only, arising from the former trait—and from that of coldness of manners—and from the great sobriety of the Quaker-character.

Another bad quality, which the world has attached to the Qua-

kers, is that of being a Sly People. This character has been long given them. We find it noticed by Pope:—

"The Quaker sly, the Presbyterian sour."

This charge is grounded on appearances. It arises in part from the last mentioned feature in their character; for, if men are thought cautious in the use of their words, and evasive in their answers, whether they be so or not, they will be marked as sly.

It arises again from the supposed trait of want of animation, or of coldness of manners: for, if men of good understanding, in consequence of a proper subjugation of their passions, appear always to be cool, they will have an appearance of wariness.

It arises, again, from the great sobriety of the Quakers. For, where men are always sober, they appear to be always on their guard; and men, who are always on their guard, are reputed cunning.

These circumstances of coolness and sobriety, when called into action, will only confirm the world in the opinion of the existence of the trait in question. For it will not be easy to deceive a man of but moderate understanding, who never looses his senses either by intoxication or by passion. And what man, in such habits, will not make a better bargain than one, who is hot in his temper, or who is accustomed to be intoxicated?

Hence the trait arises from appearances, which are the result of circumstances favorable to the morality of the Quaker-character.

CHAPTER XVII.

Last bad trait is a Disregard of Truth—apparent rise of this trait—falsehood of it probable from considerations on the language of the Quakers—from their prohibition of detraction—their rejection of romantic books—their punctuality to words and engagements—and their ideas with respect to the unlawfulness of civil oaths.

The last charge against the members of this community will be seen in a vulgar expression, which should have had no place in this book if it had not been a saying in almost everybody's mouth. The expression is, "Though they will not swear, they will lie."

This trait has arisen in part from those different circumstances, which have produced the appearance of evasiveness. For, if people are thought evasive, they will always be thought liars. Evasiveness and lying are almost synonymous terms. It is not impossible also,

if Quakers should appear to give a doubtful answer, that persons may draw false conclusions from thence, and therefore may suppose them to have spoken falsely. These two circumstances, of an apparent evasiveness, and probably of a deduction of conclusions from doubtful or imaginary premises, have, I apprehend, produced an appearance, which the world has interpreted into evil.

No trait, however, can be more false than this. I know of no people, who regard truth more than the Quakers. Their whole system bends and directs to truth. One of the peculiarities of their language, or their rejection of many of the words which other people use, because they consider them as not religiously appropriate to the objects, of which they are the symbols, serves as a constant admonition to them to speak the truth.

Their prohibition of all slanderous reports, as mentioned in a former volume, has a tendency to produce the same effect; for detraction is forbidden, partly on the idea that all such rumors on character may be false.

They reject also the reading of plays and novels, partly under a notion that the subjects and circumstances in these are fictitious, and that a taste therefore for the reading of these, if acquired, might familiarize their youth with fictions, and produce in them a romantic and lying spirit.

It is a feature, again, in their character, as we have seen, that they are remarkable for their punctuality in the performance of their words and engagements. But such punctuality implies neither more nor less than that the words spoken by them are generally fulfilled; and if they are generally fulfilled, then the inference is, that all such words have been generally truths.

To this I may add, that their notions on the subject of oaths, and their ideas of the character, which it becomes them to sustain in life, must have a powerful effect upon them in inducing an attention to the truth; for they consider Jesus Christ to have abolished civil oaths, because he meant to introduce a more excellent system than that of old: that is, because he meant it to be understood by his disciples, that he laid such an eternal obligation upon them to speak truth, that oaths were to be rendered unnecessary where persons made a profession of his religion.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SECTION I.

Character of the Quaker-women—this differs a little from that of men—women share in the virtues of the former—but do not always partake of all their reputed imperfections—are not chargeable with a want of knowledge—nor with the money-getting spirit—modesty a feature in their character.

Having now amply inquired into the character of the Men, I shall say a few words on the subject of that of the Women of this Society. For though it might have been supposed at the first sight (all the members being cast as it were in one mould) that the same character would attach to both; yet it must be obvious, on further consideration, that it cannot be wholly applicable to the female sex.

It may be laid down as a truth, that the women of this Society share in the virtues of the men. They possess their benevolence, their independence of mind, and the other good traits in their moral character. But they do not always partake of all their reputed imperfections.

The want of knowledge, which was reckoned among the failings of the men, can have no room as a charge against the women.

For, first, let us compare the Quaker-women with the Quaker-men. Now it generally happens in the world, that men have more literary knowledge than women; but this is not so generally the case in this Society. As the women here are not taken from their books, like the men, at an early age, and put into trade, they have no bar, like these, to the further improvement of their minds. They advance often in the acquisition of knowledge, while the latter, in consequence of their attention to business, are kept stationary. Hence it happens, that they are generally as well informed, and that they have as great a variety of knowledge, as these; so that they suffer no disparagement, as the women of the world do, by a comparison with the other sex.

Neither will the women of this society be considered as deficient in knowledge, if compared with women of other religious denominations. It is too much the practice, but particularly in the higher circles, to educate females for show. We too seldom see a knowledge of the domestic duties. To dance well, to sing well, and to play well,—these are the usual accomplishments that are insisted on, and they are insisted upon with an earnestness as if they included all the valuable purposes of life. Thus the best part of youth is spent in the acquirement of trivial things; or rather, the acquirement of such things takes up so much time as to leave but little for the moral

and intellectual improvement of the mind. The great object, on the other hand, of the education of the females in question, is utility, and not show. They are taught domestic economy, or the cares and employments of a house. They are taught to become good wives and good mothers. Prohibited the attainments of music, and dancing, and many of the corruptive amusements of the world, they have ample time for the improvement of the understanding. Thus they have in general as good an education as other females, as far as literary acquirements are concerned,—so that, whether they are compared with the Quaker-men, or with the other women of the island, they will not incur the imputation of a deficiency of knowledge.

It must be obvious, too, that the money-getting spirit, which the world has fixed upon as a blemish in the character of some of the men, can seldom be a trait in that of the women in this Society. For men are the principals in trade. They lay their plans for the getting of money. They see the accumulating surplus rise. They handle it. They count it. They remember it. The women, on the other hand, see it only in the disposition of their husbands, or parents, who make probably a larger allowance for domestic wants or gratifications than before. Hence a charge cannot so frequently be brought against them of a want of that spiritual-mindedness, which is the great characteristic of Quakerism, as they have but little to do with the Mammon of the world.

To these exceptions in Quaker-women from the reputed imperfections of the Quaker-men, I cannot help adding in this place, that the females of this Society are peculiarly distinguishable for that, which has been at all times considered as one of the brightest ornaments of their sex. Modesty is particularly conspicuous in their looks, and in their whole outward demeanor. It is conspicuous in their conversation. It is conspicuous also in their dress. And here it may not be improper to observe, that, whatever objections may be made to the Quaker-apparel, it is estimable as far it gives this appearance of modesty to the females, who wear it; or rather, as far it hinders them from wearing the loose and indelicate garments, which are frequently worn without any scruple by many of the females of the world.

SECTION II.

Quaker-women, besides their private, have a public character—low light in which women have been held—importance given them by chivalry—and by the revival of learning in Europe—and by the introduction of Christianity—but still held in an inferior light—Quakers have given them their due importance in society—influence of their public character on their minds.

The Quaker-women, independently of their private, have that,

which no other body of women have, a public character. This is a new era in female history. I shall therefore make a few observations on this, before I proceed to another subject.

When we look into the history of women, it is melancholy to see the low estimation, in which they have been held from the earliest times. It is possible, because they have not possessed the strength of constitution, that they may have been thought not to have had the intellect, of men. It is possible, because domestic cares and the rearing of children have been consigned to them, that other occupations may not have been considered as falling within the province of their stations. But, whatever may have been the causes, polygamy or concubinage has unquestionably been the greatest in hindering women from occupying a useful, dignified, and important station in society. This custom has held them up as little better than slaves, or than living toys or playthings. And this custom has prevailed over a great portion of the globe, from times of the earliest antiquity to the present day.

Among the many circumstances, which contributed to give importance to women in Europe, we may reckon the introduction of chivalry. Honor and humanity were the characteristics of this institution. Hence weakness was to be protected by it. And as weakness was more particularly the lot of women, so these became more peculiarly the objects of its care. Hence women began to feel a consequence, which had been hitherto denied them. They were treated with politeness and tenderness by all, and men began to be even solicitous of their applause. But though this was the case, chivalry did not elevate them beyond a certain height. It rendered a polite attention to them essential. But this attention was a homage to the weakness of females, and not to their intellect. It presupposed no capacity of usefulness in them; for every thing in fact was to be done for them, and they were to do but little for themselves.

The revival of learning in the twelfth century was another cause of adding to the importance of women. As men became more learned, they began to respect the power of the humun understanding. They began to be acquainted, by means of history, with the talents of women in former ages. They began to give a better education to their families. These circumstances produced a more enlarged opinion of female genius. Hence learning became an instrument of giving new consequence to women. But it gave it to them on a principle different from that of chivalry; for, whereas chivalry insisted upon a polite attention to them on account of the weakness of their constitutions, learning insisted upon it on account of the

strength of their understanding, or because they were intellectual and reasonable beings.

But that, which contributed most to make women important in society, was the introduction of the Christian religion. By the mild spirit, which it diffused, it produced a certain suavity of behavior towards them. By the abolition of polygamy, it allowed of no division of a man's love among many women, but limited it to one. Thus it made one woman dearer than another, and of course every individual woman of consequence. By the abolition of polygamy, it added to their consequence, again, by raising them from the rank of slaves to that of the companions of men. This importance it increased, again, by the inculcation of specific duties towards them; and by the doctrine, that as all, without exception, were equally accountable for their actions, and the Divine Being was no respecter of persons, so all, whether men or women, were of equal importance in his sight.

But though Christianity has operated, as it always will where it is received in the heart, to the production of a tender attention to women, and to the procuring of an honorable station for them in society, we have yet to lament that this operation has not been more general, considering our public profession of this religion, than we find it at the present day. Women are still weighed in a different scale from men. Their education is still limited, as if their understandings, notwithstanding the honorable testimony which history has borne concerning them, were incapable of high attainments. If homage be paid to their beauty, very little is paid to their opinions. Limits also are assigned to the sphere of their utility. To engage in other pursuits than they do, would be thought strange. In short, the education they receive marks the inferior situation, for which they are considered to be designed. Its tendency is mostly to outward show. Formed like dolls or playthings, which are given to children to captivate by outside appearances, they are generally rendered incapable of exhibiting great talents, or of occupying an important station in life.

But it seems to have been reserved for the Quakers, as a religious body, to insist upon that full practical treatment and estimation of women, which ought to take place wherever Christianity is professed. They have accordingly given to the females of their own Society their proper weight in the scale of created beings. Believing them to have adequate capacities, and to be capable of great usefulness, they have admitted them to a share in the administration of almost all the offices, which belong to their religious discipline; so that,

independently of their private, they have a public character, like the men.

In the first volume I had occasion to observe, when treating on the subject of Discipline, that representatives were chosen by the men out of their own body to the different meetings, which were then named. Just so it is with the Quaker-women. Representatives are appointed out of these by the other women on similar occasions. I stated also that at certain times the men assembled by themselves; that they discussed the business that came before them; that they replied to those, who supported opposite opinions to their own; and that the young men were present during these discussions. So it is with the women. They sit in council by themselves. They argue and reply in like manner. The young females are also present. I stated also, that during these meetings of the men, one of them held the office of drawing up and recording the minutes of the proceedings or resolutions that had taken place. The women also appoint one of their own body to the same office. I stated, again, that in these meetings of the men some were chosen as a committee, to act in particular cases. So also are women chosen to act as a committee by their own meetings. I explained the nature of the office of overseer; and I observed that there were overseers among the men. There are also overseers among the women. I explained the nature of the office of Elder; and I observed that there were Elders among the men. The women have their Elders likewise. The men were said to preach, as in other societies. The women are permitted to preach also. In short, if the men consider themselves to be qualified for any office belonging to their religious discipline, they believe their women to be equally capable of holding the same. No distinction is made as to the powers of usefulness between the men and the women of this Society. There are few offices held by men, but there is a corresponding one for those of the other sex*.

The execution of these and other public offices, by which the Quaker-women have an important station allotted them in society, can not but have an important influence on their minds. It gives them, in fact, a new cast of character. It imparts to them, in the first place, a considerable knowledge of human nature. It produces in them thought, and foresight, and judgment. It creates in them a care and concern for the distressed. It elevates their ideas. It raises in them a sense of their own dignity and importance as human beings, which sets them above every thing that is little and

* The principal exceptions are, that they are not correspondents, arbitrators, legislators, or on committees of appeal.

trifling, and above all idle parade and show. Fond as they are of the animal-creation, you do not see them lavishing their caresses on lap-dogs, to the contempt of the poor and miserable of their own species. You never see them driving from shop to shop to make up a morning's amusement by examining and throwing out of order the various articles of tradesmen, giving them great trouble, and buying nothing in return. You never find them calling upon those, whom they know to be absent from their homes, thus making their mimic visits, and leaving their useless cards. Nothing, in short, so ridiculous or degrading is known among them. Their pursuits are rational, useful, and dignified; and they may be said in general to exhibit a model for the employment of time, worthy of the character they profess.

MISCELLANEOUS PARTICULARS

RELATIVE TO THE QUAKERS.

CHAPTER I.

Quakers a happy people—subordinate causes of this happiness—namely, their comfortable situation—their attachment to domestic life—their almost constant employment—this happiness not broken, like that of others, by an interruption of the routine of constituted pleasures—or by anger and other passions—or by particular inquiries and notions about religion.

If a person were to judge of the Quakers by the general gravity of their countenances, and were to take into consideration, at the same time, the circumstance that they never partook of the amusements of the world, in which he placed a part of his own pleasures, he would be induced to conclude that they had dull and gloomy minds, and that they could not be upon the whole a happy people. Such a conclusion, however, would be contrary to the fact. On my first acquaintance with them, I was surprised, seeing the little variety of their pursuits, at the happiness, which they appeared to enjoy; but as I came to a knowledge of the constitution and state of the Society, the solution of the problem became easy.

It will not be difficult to develop the subordinate causes of this happiness*. To show the first of these, I shall view the Society in the three classes of the rich, the middle, and the poor. Of the rich I may observe, that they are not so affluent in general as the rich of other bodies. Of the middle, that they are upon the whole in better circumstances than others of the same class in life. Of the poor, that they are not so poor as others in a similar condition. Now the rich in the Society have of course as many of the comforts of life in their power as they desire. The middle classes in it have more of these than the middle classes of other denominations. The poor in

---

* Religion, which includes positive virtues and an absence from vices, joined to a peaceful conscience and a well-grounded hope of a better life, is the first and greatest cause of happiness, and may belong to all: but I confine myself in this chapter to such causes as may be called subordinate, and in which the Quakers are more particularly concerned.

it have also more of these, in consequence of the handsome provision, which is made for them, than others in a similar state of dependence. There is therefore, upon the whole, a greater distribution of the comforts of life among all the ranks of this Society, than is to be found among any other community, in proportion to their numbers. But this superior state, in point of comfortable circumstances, ought to be undoubtedly a source of superior happiness; for, where the comforts of life are wanting, it is in vain to suppose that men are happy, unless their minds are more than usually comforted by their religion.

Another source of their happiness may be found in their domestic situation. The Quakers, as I observed before, in consequence of denying themselves the pleasures of the world, have been obliged to cherish those, which are found in domestic life. In the fashionable world, men and their wives seldom follow their pleasures together. They resemble the little wooden figures of the man and the woman, which, by moving backwards and forwards in a small painted house, denote the changes of the weather. While one of these is within, the other is out of doors. But this is not the case with the Quakers. The husband and wife are not so easily separable. They visit generally together. They are remarked as affectionate. You never hear of intrigues among them. They are long in each other's society at a time, and they are more at home than almost any other people: for neither the same pleasures nor the same occupations separate these as others. The husband is never seen at a play, nor at a tavern, nor at a dance. Neither the naval nor the military professions summons him abroad. He is seldom concerned in voyages as a mariner. Hence he must of necessity be much at home. Add to this, that the Quakers have generally families, with the power of providing for them. But these circumstances render their homes agreeable to them, and increase their domestic delights

A third source of the happiness of the members of this Society arises from the circumstance of their being almost constantly employed. Few are so miserable as those, who have nothing to do, or who, unable to find employment, feel a dull vacuum in their time. And the converse of this proposition is equally true, that the time of those flies pleasantly away, who can employ it rationally. But there is rarely such a being, among the Quakers, as a lazy person gaping about for amusement. Their trades or callings occupy the greater portion of their time. Their meetings of discipline, as has been already shown, occupy their time again. The execution of the various offices, to which they may be appointed, such as overseers, or elders, or committee-men, or arbitrators in disputes, occupies more.

Few Quakers, but particularly the more respectable, have many vacant hours. And here it may not be improper to remark, that the discipline of the Society, organized as it is, is productive of a cheerful and friendly intercourse of the members, or of a sociable manner of spending their time, one with another. The monthly meetings usually bring two or three particular meetings together. The members of these, when they have dispatched their business, retire to the houses of their friends, where they take their refreshment, and indulge in the pleasures of conversation. The quarterly meetings, again, bring the monthly meetings of the county into one. Here, again, when the business is over, they partake of a similar repast. Hence a renewal of conversation and of friendship. The yearly meeting, again, brings many from the quarterly together. And here individuals from all parts of the kingdom have an opportunity of seeing and conversing with one another. I may add, too, that many of those in the interim who travel, whether on business, or on pleasure, or on religious errands, enlarge this friendly intercourse; for few Quakers pass through the towns where members live, without calling upon these; so that there are many sources within the customs, and constitutions of the Society, that are productive of cheerful hours*.

But here it will probably be said, that these sources of happiness, which have been hitherto described, are common to many others. I grant that they are to individuals, but not to communities at large. No Society has probably so many of the comforts of life in its power, number for number and rank for rank, as that of the Quakers: none probably so wholly domestic: none, where the members of it have such frequent intercourse with each other, or where they are so connected in the bonds of brotherly love: and none, as far as I know men, who have such constant employment for their time.

Having explained some of those, which may be considered as positive sources of happiness to the Society, I shall now show what may be causes of unhappiness to others, and that the Quakers seldom partake of these. Such an exposition, however strange it may appear at the first sight, will be materially to the point: for though an exemption from the causes of the uneasiness of others can never be admitted as a proof of the existence of positive enjoyment among the Quakers; yet, if the latter have solid sources of happiness of their

* It may be mentioned here, that the Quakers acknowledge their relations to a much further degree of consanguinity than other people. This relationship, where it can be distinctly traced, is commemorated by the appellation of Cousin. This custom, therefore, is a cause of endearment when they meet, and of course of additional pleasure.

own, and these are not in any material degree diminished by the causes of the uneasiness of the former, there will be left to them, because there will be no drawback, a certain portion of happiness with less alloy. And here it is obvious at the first sight, that the individuals belonging to this Society have not the same, nor so many, wants as others with respect to their pleasures, and that they do not admit the same things to be component parts of them. Hence they have not the same causes of uneasiness from the chance of interruption. Hence also their happiness is more in their own power. What individual can annihilate the comforts, which arise from their own industry, or their domestic enjoyments, or their friendly intercourse with each other, or their employments, which arise from their discipline and from their trade and callings? But how easily are many of the reputed enjoyments of the world to be broken! Some people place their happiness in a routine of constituted pleasures. In proportion as these have been frequently resorted to, they will have got into the habit as the necessary enjoyments of life. Take away, then, from persons in such habits the power of these their ordinary gratifications, and you will make them languid, and even wretched. There will be a wide chasm, which they will not know how to fill up;—a dull vacuum of time, which will make their existence insipid;—a disappointment, which will carry with it a tormenting sting. In some of the higher circles of life, accustomed to such rounds of pleasure, who does not know that the Sunday is lamented as the most cruel interrupter of their enjoyments?—No shopping in the morning,—no theater or rout in the evening,—nothing but dull, heavy, church, stares them in the face.—But I will not draw the picture at full length. I shall only observe, that where persons adopt a routine of constituted pleasures, they are creating fictitious wants for themselves, and making their own happiness subject to interruption, and putting it into the power of others. The Quakers, however, by their total rejection of all the amusements included in the routine alluded to, know nothing of the drawbacks or disadvantages described.

They are exempt, again, from several of the causes of uneasiness, which attach to the world at large. Some go to the gaming-table, and ruin themselves and their families, and destroy the peace of their minds: but the Quakers are never found injuring their fortunes or their happiness by such disreputable means.

Others disturb the harmony of their lives by intemperate sallies of passion. It has been well observed, that, whatever may be the duration of a man's anger, so much time he loses of the enjoyment of life. The Quakers, however, have but few miserable moments on this account. A due subjugation of the passions has been generally in-

stilled into them from early youth. Provocation seldom produces in them any intemperate warmth, or takes away in any material degree from the apparent composure of their minds.

Others, again, by indulging their anger, are often hurried into actions, of which the consequences vex and torment them, and of which they often bitterly repent. But the Quakers endeavor to avoid quarrelling, and therefore they often steer clear of the party and family feuds of others. They avoid, also, as much as possible, the law; so that they have seldom any of the law-suits to harrass and disturb them, which interrupt the tranquility of others by the heavy expense and by the lasting enmities they occasion.

They are exempt, again, from many of the other passions, which contribute to the unhappiness of the world at large. Some men have an almost boundless ambition: they are desirous of worldly honors, or of eminent stations, or of a public name, and pursue these objects in their passage through life with an avidity, which disturbs the repose of their minds. But the Quakers scarcely know any such feeling as that of ambition, and of course scarcely any of the torments that belong to it. They are less captivated by the splendor of honors than any other people; and they had rather live in the memory of a few valuable friends, than be handed down to posterity for those deeds, which generally constitute the basis of public character.

Others, again, who cannot obtain these honorable distinctions, envy those who possess them. They envy the very coronet upon the coach as it passes by. But the Quakers can have no such feelings as these. They pass in their pilgrimage through life regardless of such distinctions, or they estimate them but as the baubles of the day. It would be folly, therefore, to suppose that they would be envious of that, which they do not covet.

They are exempt, again, from some of the occasions of uneasiness, which arise to others from considerations on the subject of religion. Some people, for example, pry into what are denominated Mysteries. The more they look into these, the less they understand them; or rather, the more they are perplexed and confounded. Such an inquiry, too, while it bewilders the understanding, generally affects the mind. But the Quakers avoid all such curious inquiries as these; and therefore they suffer no interruption of their enjoyment from this sourse. Others, again, by the adoption of gloomy creeds, give rise frequently to melancholy, and thus lay in for themselves a store of fuel for the torment of their own minds. But the Quakers espouse no doctrines which, while they conduct themselves uprightly, can interrupt the tranquillity of their minds. It is possible there may

be here and there an instance where their feelings may be unduly affected, in consequence of having carried the doctrine of the influence of the Spirit, as it relates to their own condition, beyond its proper bounds. But individuals, who may fall into errors of this nature, are, it is to be hoped, but few; because any melancholy, which may arise from these causes, must be the effect, not of genuine Quakerism, but of a degenerate superstition.

CHAPTER II.

Good which the Quakers have done as a Society, upon earth—by their general good example—by showing that persecution for religion is ineffectual—by showing the practicability of the subjugation of the will of man—the influence of Christianity on character—the inefficacy of capital punishments—the best object of punishment—the practicability of living either in a private or public capacity in harmony and peace—the superiority of the policy of the Gospel over the policy of the world.

When we consider man as distinguished from other animals by the rational and spiritual faculties which he possesses, we cannot but conceive it to be a reproach to his nature, if he does not distinguish himself from these: or, if he does not leave some trace behind him, that he has existed rationally, and profitably both to himself and others: but if this be expected of man, considered abstractedly as man, much more will it be expected of him, if he has had the advantages of knowing the doctrines of Christianity, and the sublime example of the great Author of that religion. And the same observation, I apprehend, will hold true with respect to societies of men. For, if they have done no good during their existence, we cannot see how they can escape censure, or that it would not have been better that they had not existed at all. This consideration leads me to inquire what good the Quakers have done since their institution, as a Society, upon earth.

It was said of its members in George Fox's time, after their character had been established, that, ' if they did not stand, the nation would run into debauchery." By this, I apprehend, it was meant, that it was a desirable thing to have a people to look up to, who, residing in the midst of a vicious community, professed to be followers of that which was right, and to resist the current of bad example in their own times; or that such a people might be considered as a leaven, that might leaven the whole lump; but that, if this leaven were lost, the community might lose one of its visible incitements to

virtue. Now in this way the Quakers have had a certain general usefulness in the world. They have kept more, I apprehend, to first principles, than any other people. They have afforded a moral example. This example ought to have been useful to others. To those, who were well inclined, it should have been as a torch to light up their virtues; and it should have been a perpetual monument for reproof to others, who were entering upon a career of vice.

The first particular good, after the general one now stated, which the members of this community have done, has been, that they have shown to those, who have been spectators of their conduct, that all persecution for matters of religion, as it is highly criminal in the eyes of the supreme Being, so it is inadequate to the end proposed. This proposition, indeed, seems to be tolerably well understood at the present day. At least, they, whose minds have been well informed, acknowledge it. The history of Martyrdom, by which we learn how religion soars above all suffering, how the torments inflicted on the body are unable to reach the mind, how the moral Governor of the world reigns triumphant upon earth, how tyranny and oppression fall prostrate before virtue, losing their malignant aim, has been one, among other causes, of this knowledge. But as history is known only to few, and is not remembered by all, the Quakers are particularly useful, by holding up the truth of the proposition to our daily sight; that is, by the example they continue to afford of bearing their testimony in all cases, where the civil magistrate is concerned on the one hand, and their consciences on the other.

A second good, which the Quakers have done, is by showing, as a whole body, the power of Christianity in the subjugation of the will of men, and its influence on their character.

They are living proofs, in the first instance, that human nature is not the stubborn thing, which many have imagined it to be; that, however it may be depraved, it is still corrigible; and that this correction is universally practicable; for there are as various dispositions in this Society as in any other, in proportion to its numbers. They show that Christianity can alter the temper; that it can level enmities; and that there is no just occasion for any to despair. And they are living proofs in the second, as to what kind of character Christianity, where it is rightly received, will produce. They are living proofs that it can produce sobriety, inoffensiveness, simplicity, charity, peace, and the domestic and other virtues. Now, though every private Christian can show in himself an example of these effects, yet the Quakers show it, not by producing solitary instances, but as a Body; the temper of the great mass of their members being

apparently cast in the same mould, and their character, as a Society, being acknowledged to be that of a moral people.

And here I cannot but stop for a moment, to pay a just tribute to the Quaker-system, as one of the best modes of the Christian religion; for, whether the doctrines which belong to it, or whether the discipline which it promotes, or whether both of them conjointly, produce the effects which have been just related, certain it is that they are produced*. But that system of religion is surely the most excellent, which produces, first, the greatest, and, secondly, the most universal effect upon those who profess it. For, what is the use of any particular creed, or where is the advantage of any one creed above another, if it cannot give the great characteristic marks of a Christian, a subjugated mind, and a moral character? What signifies the creed of any particular description of Christian professors, if it has no influence on the heart; or if we see professors among these giving way to their passions, or affording an inconsistent example to the world?

The Quakers have given, again, in the reforms, which in the first volume I described them to have introduced into legislation, a beautiful and practical lesson of jurisprudence to the governors of all nations. They have shown the inefficacy of capital punishments; that the best object in the punishment of offenders is their reformation; that this accords best with the genius and spirit of the Christian religion; and that while such a system, when followed, restores the abandoned to usefulness in society, it diminishes the number of crimes.

They have shown, again, by their own example, that it is not so difficult for men to live peaceably together, as has been usually believed; and they have exhibited the means, by which they have effected this desirable end in life. And as they have proved that this is practicable in private, so they have proved, as has appeared in this volume, that it is practicable in public life; or, which is the same thing, they have shown, that in the intercourse, which exists between nations, there is no necessity for wars.

They have shown, and established, again, by the two latter instances, both of which relate to civil government, a proposition,

* Many of the Quakers in America, influenced by the custom, adopted the practice of holding slaves. But, on a due recurrence to their principles, they gave freedom to these unconditionally; thus doing another public good in the world, and giving another example of the power of religion on the mind. Some of the former masters of slaves gave them, with their freedom, a pecuniary compensation for the labor they had performed, over and above the necessary expenses attending their manumission.

which seems scarcely to be believed if we judge by the practice of statesmen, but the truth of which ought for ever be insisted upon, that the policy of the Gospel is superior to the policy of the world.

This is a portion of the good, which the Quakers have done since their appearance as a Society in the world. What other good they have done it is not necessary to specify. And as to what they would yet do, if they were permitted to become universal legislators, it may be a pleasing subject for contemplation; but it does not fall within the limits of the present chapter.

CHAPTER III.

General opinion, that the Quakers are on the decline as a Society—observations upon this subject—opinion believed upon the whole to be true—causes of this supposed declension—Mixed marriages—tithes—pursuit of trade as connected with the peculiar habits of the Society, and a residence in the towns—education.

I HAVE often heard it suggested as matter for conversation, whether the Quakers were increasing or decreasing in their number; and the result has always been an opinion that they were a declining body.

When we consider the simplicity and even philosophy of the Quaker-religion, the preservation it affords from the follies aud difficulties of life, and the happiness to which it ultimately leads, we shall wonder that the progress of the Society in point of number has not been greater than we find it. And when we consider, on the other hand, how difficult it is to be a Quaker, how much it is against the temper and disposition of man to be singular, or to resist the tide of custom and fashion, and to undergo an ordeal of suffering on these accounts, we shall wonder that it has not been long ago extinct.

That many are disowned by the Society, in consequence of which its numbers are diminished, is true. That others come into it from other quarters, by which an increase is given to it independently of its own natural population, is true also. But whether the new members exceed the disowned, or the disowned the new, is the question to be resolved. Now no people have had better opportunities of ascertaining this point than the Quakers themselves. By means of their monthly meetings they might with ease have instituted a census on a given day. They might have renewed such a census. They might have compared the returns in every case. But as no such census has ever been made, they themselves, though they have their ideas, can not speak with particular accuracy on this subject.

The general opinion however is, and the Quakers, I apprehend, will not deny but lament it, that those, who go out of the Society, are so much more numerous than those who come into it by convincement; that its natural population does not counterbalance the diminution thus occasioned; and therefore that there is, upon the whole, a decrease among them.

Of the truth of this opinion some have adduced as a proof, that the quarterly meetings have been reduced to three-fourths their original number. But this is not to be considered as a certain criterion of the fact. For it is by no means uncommon to find, if the members decrease in one county, that they increase in another. It has also been adduced, that many particular meetings have been broken up, or that meeting-houses in the country are standing deserted, or without members to worship in them. But neither can this be considered as any infallible proof of the point. For it frequently happens, that if they become less numerous in any particular village, they become more so in some of the towns of the same county. Thus no true judgment can be formed upon these principles. The Quaker-population in this respect, on account of its movements, resembles the sea, which, while it loses on one part of its shores or boundaries. gains upon another.

There are, however, considerations, which may be more decisive of the fact.

In the time of George Fox, the number of those converted to his principles was immense. This number, if we consult all the facts that might be adduced on the occasion, continued to be large in after times. Now it must be observed, that the Quakers are a sober and temperate people; that they generally marry at a proper age, and that they have large families. It is therefore impossible, if the descendants of the early members had continued in the Society, that their number should have been much larger than we find it at the present day; and, if so, there must have been a secession, or an expulsion, amounting, notwithstanding all influx by conversion or population, to a decrease.

It is obvious, again, that the Quakers, in consequence of their industry and their frugal habits, must almost unavoidably grow rich. Now if the descendants of the early Quakers had remained in the Society, we should have seen more overgrown fortunes in it than among others, in proportion to their numbers. But this is contrary to the fact. The very richest, as the world now goes, would not be considered to be particularly rich; and it is a truth, that those, who are affluent among them, have generally been the founders, by means of their industry and integrity, of their own fortunes.

It is, again, a matter of observation among the Quakers, now grown into a truth, that if men grow rich in the Society their grandchildren generally leave it. But surely this amounts to a confession, that in a particular part of the Society there are the seeds of a regular and successive decrease.

That the Quakers, then, upon the whole are a declining body, there can be no doubt*. While I state it, I lament it. I lament that there should be any diminution of number among those, who have done so much good in the world, and who have so justly obtained the reputation of a moral people. This consideration will lead me to inquire into the causes of this decline. It will impel me also to inquire into the means of remedy. How far I may be successful in the latter attempt, I am unable to say. But it will always be a pleasing consideration to me, to have tried to prevent the decrease of a virtuous people.

With respect, then, to the causes of this decline, to which I shall confine myself in this chapter, they will be found in the causes of Disownment. Now of these some may be called original and immediate, and others original and remote.

Of original and immediate, the first is what the Quakers call Mixed Marriage. It has been before stated, that those, who marry out of the Society, are disowned, and the reasons for such disownments have been given.

A second will be found in Tithes. They, who pay these, are ultimately disowned. They are disowned as well for the payment of lay-tithes as of those, which are ecclesiastical.

Of the original and remote, a very prolific cause is the pursuit of Trade, connected as it is with the peculiar habits of the Society, and a residence within the towns.

To show this, I must observe, first, that the poor, comparatively speaking, are seldom disowned, for they know that they shall never be so well provided for in any other Society†. I must observe, again, that the members of the middle classes are also, comparatively speaking, but seldom disowned. These must live by trade; but if so, they cannot be better off than as Quakers. The direct conclusion then

* Against this decrease we can not set off any great increase by admission into membership. The dress, the language, the fear of being singular, the discipline with its various restraints, the unwillingness of men to suffer where suffering can be avoided—these and other circumstances are great impediments in the way of an entrance into this Society; and to this I may add, that applications for admission into it are not always complied with.

† I by no means intend to say that the poor do not remain in the Society from an attachment to its principles, but that the other may be a political motive also.

from these observations will be, that the greater number of those, who are disowned, will be found among the rich, or among such as are growing rich. Hence it appears that, as far as this original and remote cause is concerned, my inquiry must be, how it happens that members of this particular class should be excluded from membership more than those of any other.

In answer to this inquiry, I must say, as I have observed before, that Quakers in trade, having as good abilities and as much intelligence and integrity as others, will succeed as well as others in it; but that, having fewer sources of outgoings, their savings will be generally greater. Hence they will have before their eyes the sight of a greater accumulation of wealth. But in proportion as such accumulation of substance is beheld, the love of it increases. Now while this love increases, or while their hearts are unduly fixed on the Mammon of the world, they allow many little inconsistencies in their children to escape their reproof. But besides this, as religion and the love of the Mammon of the world are at variance, they have a less Spiritual discernment than before. Hence they do not see the same irregularities in the same light. From this omission, then, to check these irregularities on the one hand, and from this decay of their Spiritual vision on the other, their children have greater liberties allowed them than others in the same Society. But as these experience this indulgence, or as these admit the customs and fashions of the world, they grow more fond of them. Now, as they live in towns, the spark that is excited is soon fanned into a flame. Fashion and fashionable things, which they cannot but see daily before their eyes, begin to get the dominion. When they are visited by wholesome advisers, they dislike the interference. They know they shall be rich. They begin to think the discipline of the Society a cruel restraint. They begin to dislike the Society itself; and, committing irregularities, they are sometimes in consequence disowned. But if they should escape disownment themselves, they entail it generally upon their children. These are brought up in a still looser manner than themselves. The same process goes on with these as with their parents, but in a still higher degree, till a conduct utterly inconsistent with the principles of the Society occasions them to be separated from it. Thus, in the same manner as war, according to the old saying, begets poverty, and poverty, peace; so the pursuit of trade, with the peculiar habits of the Society, leads to riches, riches to fashion and licentiousness, and fashion and licentiousness to disownment: so that many individuals educate their children as if there were to be no Quakers in the second generation from themselves. And thus, though, strictly speaking, irregularities are the immediate occasion

of these disownments, they are ultimately to be attributed to the original and remote cause, as now described*.

That this is by no means an unreasonable account, I shall show, in some measure, by an appeal to facts. The American Quakers sprang from the English. The English, though drained in consequence, were still considerable, when compared with the former. But it is remarkable that the American exceed the English by at least five times their number at the present day. Now it must undoubtedly be confessed, that the American have advantages, as far as this fact is concerned, which the English have not. They have no tithes as a cause of disownment. Their families also, I believe, increase more rapidly. Many persons also, as will be the case in a country that is not fully settled, live in the neighborhood of the Quakers, but at a distance from those of other denominations; and therefore, wishing to worship somewhere, seek membership with them. Besides, the Quakers in America are so numerous, as to bear a larger proportion to the general population. This circumstance renders them more respectable, and their children less disposed to leave a Society so generally esteemed. But I apprehend that a great cause of the disparity of the numbers of the two lies in another circumstance, namely, in the difference of their situation; that whereas the great Quaker-population in England is in the towns with but a remnant in the country, the great Quaker-population in America is in the country, with but a remnant in the towns†. And that the Americans themselves believe that the place of the residence of their members is connected, in some measure, with the increase and decrease of their Society, it is fair to presume from this circumstance; that, in several of the quarterly meetings in America, advice has been given to parents to bring up their children in the country, and as little as possible in the towns.

Another of the original and remote causes is Education. This, as it becomes promotive of the diminution of the Society, is of two kinds. The first may be called Alien. The second is such as is afforded in the Society itself.

Some parents, growing rich and wishing to give their children a better education than they can get in their own schools, send them

---

* I hope I shall not be understood as involving the rich in a promiscuous censure. I know as amiable examples among these, and among their children, as among others of the Society. But we must naturally expect more deviations among the rich, number for number, than among others.

† The number of the Quakers is undoubtedly great in one or two of the cities in America, but the whole town population is not great when compared with the whole country-population there.

to others to be instructed. Now the result has not been desirable, where it has been designed that such children should be continued members. For, how is a poor solitary Quaker-boy to retain the peculiarities belonging to his religious profession in the face of the whole school? Will not his opinions and manners be drowned as it were in the torrent of the opinions and manners of the rest? How can he get out of this whirlpool pure? How on his return will he harmonize with his own Society? Will not either he or his descendants leave it? Such an education may make him, undoubtedly, both a good and an enlightened man,—and so far one of the most desirable objects in life will have been accomplished,—but it certainly has a tendency to weaken the peculiar institution of Quakerism.

The education, which is afforded in the Society itself, is divisible again into two kinds; into that which is moral or religious, and into that which is literary or philosophical.

It must undoubtedly be confessed, in looking into that which is moral or religious, that sufficient care is not always taken with regard to youth. We sometimes see fathers and sons, and mothers and daughters, so different in their appearance and deportment, that we should scarcely have imagined them to be of the same family. I am not now speaking of those parents, who may live in the towns, and who may be more than ordinarily devoted to the Mammon of the world, but of some who, living both in town and country, give an example of a liberal and amiable spirit, and of a blameless conduct to the world. That the former should neglect and lose sight of their offspring, when their moral vision is clouded by an undue eagerness after money, is not to be wondered at; but that the latter should do it, is surprising. It is certainly true that some of these are too indulgent in their families, contrary to the plan and manner of their own education, or that they do not endeavor to nip in the bud all rising inconsistencies. The consequence is, that their children get beyond control in time; when they lament in vain their departure from the simplicity of the Society. Hence the real cause of their disownment, which occasionally follows, is not in the children running out of bounds, but in the parents running out of bounds in the manners of their children. And here I may add, that some parents, dwelling too much on the disuse of forms in religion, because such disuse is inculcated by their own doctrines, run into the opposite extreme, and bring up their children in too much ignorance of the general plan of Christianity, as it is laid down in the letter of the Scriptures.

With respect to education, as far as it is literary or philosophical, it is frequently sufficient for those, upon whom it is bestowed. But

it does not appear to me to be carried to its proper extent in the case of the children of the rich, when I consider how friendly it might be made towards the promotion of virtue. Some we know, growing wealthy, have had children when they were poorer, and, when in this poorer state, they have given them an education which was suitable to it, not calculating upon their future rise in life. But their children, having had such a limited education, have not had that, which has been proper for their subsequent station. Others, again, who have been born in better circumstances, have, on account of an undue depreciation of human knowledge, educated their children as improperly for their station as the former. The children, then, in both these cases, have not had an education sufficient, with the prospect of riches before them, to keep them out of the way of harm. They have not had, in addition to any religious instruction, that taste given them for sublime pursuits, which should make them despise those which were frivolous. Thus many of the corruptive opinions, fashions, and amusements of the world have charmed them. Giving way to these, they have been overcome; when overcome, they have run into excesses; and for these excesses they have been disowned. But, with a better education, they would probably have thought all such corruptive opinions, fashions, and amusements as below their notice, and unworthy their countenance and support.

CHAPTER IV.

Supposed remedies for the diminution of some of these causes—Regulations in the case of mixed marriages—Measures to be adopted in the pursuit of trade—Education, as it is moral or religious, to be more strictly enforced in some families—as it is literary or philosophical, to be carried to a greater extent among the children of the rich—Object of this latter education—nature of it, as consisting both of knowledge and prohibitions—how it would operate against the fascinating allurements of the world, or to the end proposed.

I PURPOSE now to suggest, as briefly as I can, such remarks as, if adopted, might possibly operate as remedies to some of the evils, which have been described. In doing this, I am aware of the difficulties that await me. I am sensible that I ought not to be too sanguine as to the result of all my observations upon this subject, and yet I can not but think that I may be successful in some of them. Arduous, however, as the task, and dubious as my success may be, I am encouraged, on the prospect of being at least partially useful, to undertake it.

On the first of the original and immediate causes, which have been mentioned, I mean mixed marriages, I shall have but little to say. I do not see how it is possible, while the Society means to keep up a due subordination among its members, not to disown such as may marry out of it. In mixed families, such as these marriages produce, it is in vain to expect that the discipline can be carried on, as has been previously shown. And without this discipline the Society could hardly keep up, in the extensive manner it does, the character of a moral people. I think, however, that some good might be done by regulations to be universally observed. Thus they, who are deputed to inform the disowned of their exclusion from membership, should be of the most amiable temper and conciliatory manners. Every unqualified person should be excluded from these missions. Permission should be solicited for both the married persons to be present on such occasions. It is difficult to estimate the good effect, which the deputed, if of sweet and tender dispositions, or the bad effects, which the deputed, if of cold and austere manners, might have upon those they visited, or what bias it might give the one in particular, who had never been in membership, for or against the Society. Permission also might be solicited, even when the mission was over, for future friendly opportunities or visits, which would show in the Society itself a tender regard and solicitude for the welfare of its former members. It is not at all improbable, from the impression, which such apparent regard and solicitude might occasion, that the children of the visited, though not members, might be brought up in the rules of membership. And, finally, it appears to me to be desirable that the disowned, if they should give proof, by their own lives and the education of their children, of their attachment to the principles of the Society, and should solicit restoration to membership, should be admitted into it again, without exacting from them painful or improper acknowledgments, or wholly as new and convinced members.

With respect to the second of the immediate and original causes, which is to be found in tithes, I may observe, that it is, as far as I can collect, but a small and an inferior one; few being disowned on this account, and still fewer now than formerly. It would be desirable, however, few as these instances may be, to prevent them. But I fear that no remedy can be pointed out, in which the Quakers would acquiesce, except it could be shown that a distinction might be made between the payment of ecclesiastical and lay tithes, which would not interfere with the Great Tenets of the Society on this subject.

A third cause of disownment, but this belongs to the original and

remote, was shown to be the pursuit of trade, connected as it is with the peculiar habits of the Society, and a residence in the towns. I may propose as remedies for this: First, that parents should be careful to exhibit a good example to their children. Secondly, as I have before observed, that they should prescribe to themselves moderation in the acquisition of wealth, either by relinquishing trade at a given time, or by dealing out the profits of it more liberally than common in the way of benevolence, so that their children, in each case, may never have the misfortune of the prospect of a large moneyed independence before their eyes. Or, lastly, that they should give them a better education than they do at present; on which subject, according to the prescribed order of things, I am now to speak.

A fourth cause, then, but this belongs also to the original and remote, was shown to exist in education. And education, as it was promotive of the diminution of the Society, was of two kinds.

With respect to that part of it, which is alien, the remedy is easy. There has been great difficulty in procuring proper schoolmasters, I mean such as has been members. Two reasons may be given for this. The first is, that, the Society having been backward in affording due encouragement to learning, few of any great literary acquisitions have been brought up in it. The second is, that persons have found that they could make much less of their time in such a line of employment than in the way of trade. But surely the Quakers, as a body in comfortable and independent circumstances, might easily remedy the evil. Does not a man, who devotes his time to the instruction of youth, deserve to be made as comfortable as the man who sells silver utensils, or bracelets, or ear-rings, or other articles of trade? Is there any comparison between the moral usefulness of these? Is there any profession more useful than that which forms the youthful mind? or, rather, Is it not the most important profession in the state*?

With respect to the education, which is acquired in the Society itself, the remedy is not difficult. This education was shown to be of two kinds.

On that part of it, which is moral or religious, I may observe, that the remedy is in the parents themselves. The first thing to be recommended is an universal vigilance over the disposition and manners of children, so that no censurable appearance, whether in tem-

---

* It is but justice to the Quakers to observe, that they are taking more pains than formerly in the promotion of this object. I am told that there are more private seminaries, now kept by Quakers for the education of the youth of their own Society, than even before the institution of Ackworth School.

per or in conduct, may be allowed to pass without suitable notice or reproof; or that the bud, which promises to be corruptive of morals, should no sooner make its appearance than it should be cut off. In cases of so much importance, as where the happiness both of parents and children is concerned, the former should be peculiarly circumspect. They should not talk about things, but insist upon them, on all proper occasions. They should not point out, but redress. They should not lop off the branches, but lay the axe to the root. And surely youth is the best season for such wholesome interference. It is, in the first place, the season in which a remedy is practicable; for we are assured, if "we train up a child in the way he should go, that when he is old he will not depart from it." It is, secondly, the season in which it is most practicable; for, can we hope to bend the tree so easily to our form, as the sapling from whence it came? And, thirdly, it is the season in which only it is practicable; for, will not a small irregularity grow, if uncontrolled, to a greater? Will not one irregularity, also, if not properly checked, give birth to others? And may not these be so incorporated into the inner man, in a course of time, that it may be as difficult for parents to eradicate them, as for the Ethiopian to change his color, or the leopard his spots? But surely the Quakers ought to know the impropriety of undue indulgences in their families, as well as any other people. Is not the early subjugation of the will a doctrine more particularly adopted by them as a Society? Without such a subjugation, do they not conceive the mind to be in an unfit state to receive the admonitions of the pure Principle, and of course to make a true proficiency in religion? Do they not consider themselves also as a highly professing people, and do they not know that the world expects more from them than from others? But how can their children ever perpetuate this extraordinary character after them, or show that their parents possessed it, unless they are brought up in a peculiarly guarded manner? In addition to these observations, it may be recommended that parents should be careful to give their children what may be called a literal instruction in Christianity, in contradistinction to pure Theism, or to those doctrines, which they conceive may come from the teachings of the Holy Spirit, so that they may have a more intimate knowledge of all their principles, as a Christian body.

With respect to that part of education, which may consist of knowledge as it is literary or philosophical, I conceive it might be attended with advantage to carry it to a greater extent than has hitherto been practised in the Society, but particularly the latter. Nothing is so delightful to youth as experimental philosophy, by which they see the causes of things unfolded to their view. No science takes their

attention more, or inclines them, in the further pursuit of it, to be satisfied with home. And yet I doubt whether this branch of learning be not almost wholly neglected in the Quaker-schools. The education, which is received in the Society, as it consists of the two kinds of knowledge described, is not, in my apprehension, carried far enough, so as to suit the peculiar situation of the children of the rich. These are they, who are most in danger. These are they, who, having the prospect of wealth before them, have the prospect of being able to procure destructive pleasures. These are they, who, having the prospect of independence, do not fear the opinion of the world, or the loss of reputation in it, like those, who have their livelihood to obtain by their own industry. Now it should be the particular object of the education of these, as indeed it should of all rich persons, so to instruct them, that, while they are obliged to live in the world, they may be enabled to live out of it, or deny it; so that, when seated amidst its corruptive opinions, amusements, and fashions, they should estimate them as below their notice, and as utterly unworthy their countenance and support.

I should be sorry if, in holding up this species of education to a further encouragement, as a preservative of the morals of the children of rich parents amidst the various temptations of life, I were to be thought to endeavor to take away in any degree the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the mind of man, or to deny that this spirit ought not to be resorted to as the first and best guide, both by rich and poor, during their pilgrimage upon earth. For, who can teach us best to deny the world? Who can teach us best to estimate its pursuits? Who can instruct us best to resist its temptations? To the Divine Being, then, we are first to look up, as to him who can be the best author of all our good, and the surest averter of all our evils; who can apply the best remedy to the imperfections of our nature; and who, while he leads us in safety, can lead us into the way of truth. But when we consider how many are inattentive, on account of the cares, and pleasures, and fashions, and prejudices, and customs of the world, to the secret notices of his grace, I can not help considering that we may be allowed to have secondary and subordinate helps to our virtue. As the discipline of the Society may produce and preserve a certain purity of life, so may a literary and philosophical education operate to the same end. Such an education is in its general tendency a friend to the promotion of virtue, and to the discouragement of vice. It sets us often unquestionably above many of the corruptive opinions and customs in the midst of which we live. It leads us also frequently to the contemplation of the Divine Being in all the variety of his works. It gives us amia-

ble, awful, and sublime conceptions of him. As far therefore as it is capable of doing this, it is a useful though it be only a subordinate source of our purity, and we may therefore adopt it innocently. But we are never to forget, at the same time, that, though it may help us occasionally to resist corrupt temptations, and to encourage desirable propensities, yet it cannot do every thing for us that is necessary, and that we are never to overlook, on this account, the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit.

To show in what the education, which, under these limitations, I am going to propose, may consist, I shall revive the controversy between the philosophical moralists and the Quakers, as described in the eighth chapter of the first volume. The philosophical moralists contended, That knowledge was to be preferred, as being more to be relied upon than prohibitions; that prohibitions were often causes of greater evil than they were intended to prevent; that they themselves were friends to occasional indulgences; that they saw nothing necessarily or inherently mischievous in the amusements of the world; that it was not wise to anticipate danger, by looking to distant prospects where the things were innocent in themselves; that ignorance of vice was no guardian of morals; that causes and not sub-causes were to be contended against; and that there was no certain security but in knowledge and a love of virtue. To this the Quakers replied, That prohibitions were sanctioned by divine authority; that, as far they related to the corrupt amusements of the world, they were implied in the spirit of Christianity; that the knowledge, which should be promotive of virtue, could not be inculcated without them; that knowledge, again, if it were to be acquired by the permission of occasional indulgences, or by being allowed to pass through scenes which might be dangerous to virtue, would be more ruinous than ignorance by a prohibition of vice; that ignorance of vice was an essential in Christian morals; and that prohibitions therefore were indispensably necessary, and better to be relied upon than any corrupt knowledge, which might arise from an acquaintance with the customs of the world.

This then was the state of the controversy as described in the first volume. And in this state it was left. But to explain the education I have in view, I shall now bring it to a conclusion.

I must observe, then, that the philosophical moralists had the advantage of the Quakers in this controversy, inasmuch as they supposed that knowledge was a better safeguard to morals, than a mere ignorance of vice; but they failed in this, that they permitted this knowledge to be acquired by passing through scenes, which might not be friendly to virtue. Now this latter permission is inadmissible

in a Christian education; for no Christian youth ought, if it can be avoided, to be permitted to see, or to hear, that which ought not to be uttered or exhibited by a Christian. The Quakers, on the other hand, had the advantage of the philosophical moralists, inasmuch as they considered ignorance to be better than corrupted knowledge; but they failed in this, that they seemed to rely upon ignorance of vice, as a safeguard against it, without a proper proportion of knowledge. The education, then, to which I allude, ought to embrace the most valuable positions of both. It should consist of knowledge, and it should consist of wise prohibitions also. Knowledge and prohibitions are inseparable. While the mind is gaining knowledge, it should be kept innocent; and while it is kept innocent, it should be gaining knowledge. Youth should have that kind of knowledge instilled into them, by which they should discern the value of the prohibitions, which are enjoined them. They should have such and so much knowledge, that, if they were accidentally placed in the way of the things prohibited, they should be able to look them in the face, and pass through them without injury. This is that education, which, without superceding the necessity of the influence of the Holy Spirit, has a tendency to enable persons, while they live in the world, to live out of it, or to deny it.

But lest I should not be clearly understood upon this subject, I will exemplify how such an education would act or operate to the end proposed.

And, first of all, knowledge may be acquired by reading. Now there are two kinds of reading; the one useful, the other dangerous. By the premises, I am to adopt the first, and to prohibit the last. If then I accustom my child to the best and purest models of ancient and modern literature, I give him a certain taste for composition. If I accustom him to the purest and most amiable sentiments, as contained in these, I give him a love of virtue. If I heighten these sentiments by beautiful selections from the more pure and amiable senments of Christianity, I increase that love. If I give him in my own conduct an example, he sees me practice that which I recommend. I give him then a taste for the purest reading and the choicest composition, and I offer to his notice, at the same time, a certain system of morality, which he cannot but gradually adopt as his own.

Now I would ask, what influence could a novel have upon a mind formed in this manner, if thrown accidentally in his way? If its composition were but moderate, as is the case with most of them, it would not suit the taste of my child. If its sentiments were impure, it would disgust him. These would be so contrary to the taste and to the feelings he had acquired, that the poison in such a book, like a

ball fired at a globular surface, would slide off without detriment to the morals of my child.

Knowledge, again, may be acquired in the course of amusements, and of such as may be resorted to within doors. Now of these again there are two kinds, the innocent and the corruptive. By the premises, I am to be concerned with the first only. If then I accustom my child to mathematical and philosophical pursuits; if I excite him to experiments in these; if I assist him in measuring the motions of the heavenly bodies, and in discovering the wisdom and power of Omnipotence as displayed in these; if I occasion him to be interested in the contemplation of such objects, what have I done for my child? Have I not called out his intellectual faculties? Have I not laid in him the foundation of a serious and a thoughtful mind? Have I not accustomed him to solid things, in opposition to those that are light; and to sublime things, in opposition to those that are frivolous? Have I not inculcated in him a love for science?—But take my child after he has been accustomed to such thoughts and such subjects, to the theatre; let the pantomime display its various attracting scenes to his view; and will he not think his entertainment low and superficial, in comparison of that which he left at home?

Knowledge, again, may be acquired by amusements, which are out of doors. These, again, may be innocent or exceptionable. As before, I have nothing to do but with the former. If, then, I accustom my child to range the fields, as an employment promotive of his health, and connect this healthy exercise with the entertainment of botanical pursuits,—do I not, in examining with him the shape, the color, and the mechanism of plants and flowers, confirm in him his former love of the works of Nature? Do I not confirm his former notion of the wisdom and power of Omnipotence? Do I not teach him by these and the other pursuits, which have been mentioned, that all recreations should be innocent, and that time should be wisely employed? But hark! another amusement, and one of those which are followed out of doors, is at hand. The hounds are in view, and fast approaching. My son is accidentally solicited to join them. He would ask my permission, but I am absent. At length he goes. He follows them in wild tumult and uproar for an hour. He sees some galloping over hedges and ditches like madmen, and hazarding their persons in a presumptuous manner. He sees others ride over the cultivated fields of their neighbors, and injure the rising corn. He finds that all this noise and tumult, all this danger and injury, are occasioned by the pursuit of a little hare, whose pain is in proportion to the joy of those who follow it. Now can this diversion, educated as my child has been, fascinate him? Will he not question its inno-

cence? And will he not question its consistency as a natural pursuit, or as an employment for his time?

It is thus, then, that knowledge will be found to operate as an artificial and innocent preservative against the destructive pleasures of the world. But prohibitions without knowledge will be but of little avail, where there is a prospect of riches, and the power of gratifying any improper appetites as they may rise. But by knowledge we shall be able to discover the beauty of things, so that their opposites or the things prohibited, will cease to charm us. By knowledge we shall be able to discern the ugliness of the things prohibited, so that we shall be enabled to loathe them, if they should come into our way. And thus an education conducted upon the principles of knowledge may operate to the end proposed.

CHAPTER V.

Education continued, as consisting of knowledge and prohibitions — Good which the Quakers have done by prohibitions without any considerable knowledge—greater good which they would do with it—Knowledge, then, a great desideratum in their education — favorable state of the Society for the communication of it with purity, or without detriment to morals—in what this knowledge should consist—general advantages of it—peculiar advantages which it would bring to the Society.

When we consider that men have all the same moral nature, we wonder, at the first sight, at the great difference of conduct, which they exhibit on earth. But when we consider the power of education upon the mind, we seem to lose our surprise. If men in all countries were educated alike, we should find a greater resemblance in their character. It is, in short, education, which makes the man; and as education appears to me to be of so much importance in life, I shall make it the subject of this and the succeeding chapter.

All education should have two objects in view; the opening of the understanding, and the improvement of the heart. Of the two, the latter is most important. There cannot be a question, whether the person of the most desirable character be the virtuous or the learned man. Without virtue, knowledge loses half its value. Wisdom without virtue may be said to be merely political; and such wisdom, whenever it belongs to a man, is little better than the cunning or craftiness of a fox. A man of a cultivated mind without an unshaken love of virtue is but a dwarf of a man. His food has done him no good, as it has not contributed to his growth. And it would have

been better, for the honor of literature, if he had never been educated at all. The talents of man, indeed, considering him as a moral being, ought always to be subservient to religion. "All philosophy," says the learned Cudworth, "to a wise man, to a truly sanctified mind, as he in Plutarch speaketh, is but matter for Divinity to work upon. Religion is the queen of all those inward endowments of the soul; and all pure natural knowledge, all virgin and undeflowered arts and sciences, are her handmaids, that rise up and call her blessed."

Now, if the opening of the understanding and the improvement of the heart be the great objects to be attained, it will follow, that both knowledge and wise prohibitions should always be component parts of the education of youth. The latter the Quakers have adopted ever since the institution of their Society. The former they have been generally backward to promote, at least to any considerable extent. That they have done good, however, by their prohibitions, though unaccompanied by any considerable knowledge, it would be disingenuous not to acknowledge. But this good has been chiefly confined to the children of those, who have occupied middle stations in the Society. Such children have undoubtedly arrived at the true wisdom of life at an early age, as I have before described, and have done honor to the religion they professed. But prohibitions without knowledge have not been found to answer so well among the children of those, who have had the prospect of a large moneyed independence before them, and who have not been afraid either of the bad opinion of their own Society, or of the bad opinion of the world. It has been shown, however, that knowledge with prohibitions would in all probability be useful to these; that it would have a tendency to enable them, in the perilous situation in which they are placed, to stand against corrupt opinions and fashions; and, while they were living in the world, to live out of it or to deny it.

Peculiarly situated as the Quakers are, they have opportunities, beyond any other people, of ingrafting knowledge into their system of education without danger, or, in other words, of giving knowledge to their children with the purity, which Christianity would prescribe. The great misfortune in the world is, that a learned education is frequently thought more of than a virtuous one: that youth, while they obtain knowledge, are not properly watched and checked; and that they are suffered to roam at large in the pursuit of science, and to cultivate or not, at their own option, the science, if I may so call it, of religion. Hence it will happen, that where we see learned men, we shall not always see persons of the most exemplary character. But the Quakers have long ago adopted a system of prohibi-

tions, as so many barriers against vice or preservatives of virtue. Their constitution forbids all indulgences that appear unfriendly to morals. They may therefore, while they retain the prohibitions which belong to their constitution, give encouragement to knowledg, without a fear that it will be converted to the purposes of vice.

They have opportunities, again, or advantages, which others have not, in another point of view. In the great public Seminary at Ackworth, which belongs to them, and which is principally for those who are of the poor and middle classes, every thing is under the inspection and guidance of committees, which can watch and enforce an observance of any rules that may be prescribed. Why, then, if public seminaries were instituted for the reception of the children of the rich, or if the rich were to give encouragement to large private seminaries for the same purposes, should they not be placed under the visiting discipline of the Society? Why should they not be placed under the care of committees also? Why should not these committees see that the two great objects of the education proposed were going on at the same time; or that, while knowledge was obtaining, discipline had not been relaxed? Why should not such seminaries produce future Penns, and Barclays, and others, who, while they were men capable of deep literary researches, should be exemplary for their virtue?

As knowledge then ought to form a part of the proposed education, on a much larger scale than has been hitherto encouraged, I shall say a few words as to the component parts of it, and as to the general advantages of these; and I shall afterwards speak to the advantages, which the Society in particular would derive from such a change.

In the education I propose, I do not mean in the slightest manner to break in upon the moral system of the Quakers, as previously described. I do not propose to them the polite arts. I do not recommend to them to make their children musicians, or that they should learn, under the dancing-master, to step gracefully. I advise only such knowledge as will be strictly innocent and useful.

In the first place, I recommend a better classical education. Classical knowledge gives the foundation both of particular and universal grammar. While it gives the acquisition of the dead languages, it is the root, and therefore facilitates the acquisition, of many of the living. As most of the technical terms in the professions and sciences are borrowed from these languages, it renders them easily understood. The study of the structure and combination of words and sentences calls forth the reflecting powers of youth, and expands their genius. It leads to penetration and judgment. It induces

habits of diligence and patience. By means of this knowledge we have access to the sacred writings in the languages in which they were written, and we are therefore not liable to be imposed upon for the sense of them by others. We become acquainted also, by means of it, with the sentiments and knowledge of the antients. We see their thoughts and expressions. We acquire a literary taste.

A knowledge of antient history is necessarily connected with a knowledge of the Classics. To this, however, should be added that of the modern. History*, while it entertains us, instructs us morally. We can not see the rise and fall of empires, or the causes of their formation and dissolution, or read the histories of good and bad men, without impressions of moral importance to ourselves. I purpose to add a knowledge of Ecclesiastical History to this account.

A philosophical education is peculiarly important. By this I mean a general knowledge of the mathematics, of mechanics, optics, hydrostatics, astronomy, chemistry, botany, and the like. The teaching of these should be accompanied by experiments. Experimental philosophy, as I observed before, is peculiarly interesting to youth. Such knowledge teaches us the causes of things. Mysteries, hitherto hidden both in the garden and in the field, and in the heaven and in the air, lie unfolded to our view. Every walk we take, while the surface of the earth remains as it is, and the canopy of the firmament is spread over us, gives us the opportunity, in all the innumerable objects presented to our view, of almost endless investigation and delight. And the deeper we go into the hidden things of nature, and the more we unfold them, have we not a firmer belief of the existence of the Creator, and more sublime notions of the symmetry, order, beauty, and wisdom of his works? Such knowledge leads also, as it has always done, to discoveries, by which we may make ourselves useful to mankind. And besides the utility of which it may make us capable, discoveries of the principles of Nature may be said to have a tendency to augment our love and admiration of the first great Cause.

To philosophical knowledge, which may also include architecture, rhetoric, and logic, should be added general reading. Such reading should be of the purest kind. Of knowledge, acquired in this manner, it may be said, that it opens new sources of right views and sentiments, and this even independently of Christianity, from which our most valuable information is derived. Thus, at a time when, as a nation, we professed to be Christians, we shed the blood of the martyrs. Thus, when even such men as the great Sir Matthew Hale,

* Under this term may be included Select Voyages and Travels.

one of the brighest Christian patterns in our country, were at the head of it, we condemned persons to death for witchcraft. But knowledge, superior to that of those times, has taught us better things. By means of it we perceive that persecution does not destroy, but that it propagates opinions, and that the belief of the existence of witchcraft is absurd.

These then appear to me to be general advantages, or such as are inseparable from education, when composed of the various branches of knowledge, which have been described. I shall now endeavor to show the peculiar advantages, which the Quakers would derive from it.

It will appear, then, if we look back into the character of the members of this Society, as described in this volume, that the world charges them, I mean the more affluent part of them, with having less learning than others in a similar rank of life. But surely the education I propose would remove this intellectual defect.

The world, again, as we have seen, has fixed another intellectual blemish upon them by the imputation of superstition. But how does superstition enter unless there is a want of knowledge? Does not all history bear testimony, that, in proportion as men have been more or less enlightened, they have been more or less liable to this charge? It is knowledge, then, which must banish this frightful companion of the mind. Wherever individuals acknowledge, in a more extensive degree than usual, the influence of the Divine Spirit in man, these of all other people will find the advantages of it. Knowledge leads to a solution of things, as they are connected with philosophy, or the theory of the human mind. It enables men to know their first and second causes, and to distinguish between causes and occasions. It fixes the nature of action and of thought, and, by referring effects to their causes, it often enables them to draw the line between the probability of fancy and inspiration. How many good men are there, who, adopting a similar creed with that of the Quakers on this subject, make themselves uneasy by bringing down the Divine Being, promiscuously and without due discrimination, into the minute concerns of their lives! How many are there, who attribute to him that which is easily explained by the knowledge of common causes! Thus, for instance, there are appearances in nature, which a person of an uninformed mind, but who adopts the doctrine of the influence of the Spirit, would place among signs, and wonders, and divine notices, which others acquainted with the philosophy of nature would almost instantly solve. Thus, again, there may be occasions which persons, carrying the same doctrine to an undue extent, might interpret into warning or prophetic voices, but which a due exercise of the intellect, where such exercise has been properly encouraged,

would easily explain. This reminds me of a singular occurrence. A friend of mine was lately walking in a beautiful vale. In approaching a slate-quarry, he heard an explosion, and a mass of stone, which had been severed by gunpowder, fell near him as he walked along. He went immediately to the persons employed. He represented to them the impropriety of their conduct in not having given proper notice to such as were passing by, and concluded by declaring emphatically, that they themselves would be soon destroyed. It happened but six weeks afterwards, that two of these men were blown to pieces. The words then of my friend were verified. Now I have no doubt that ignorant persons, in the habit of referring everything promiscuously to the Divine interference, would consider my friend as a prophet, and his words as a divinely forewarning voice. But what did my friend mean? or where did he get his foresight on this occasion? The answer is, that my friend, being accustomed to the exercise of his rational faculties, concluded that, if the people in question were so careless with respect to those who should be passing by in such times of danger, they would by custom become careless with respect to themselves, and that ultimately some mischief would befall them. It is knowledge, then, acquired by a due exercise of the intellectual powers, and through the course of an enlightened education, which will give men just views of the causes and effects of things; and which, while it teaches them to discover and acknowledge the Divine Being in all his wondrous works, and properly to distinguish him in his* providences, preserves them from the miseries of superstition.

The world, again, has fixed the moral blemish of the money-getting spirit upon the Quaker-character. But knowledge would step in here, also, as a considerable corrector of the evil. It would show that there were other objects besides money, which were worthy of pursuit. Nor would it point out only new objects: it would make a scale of their comparative importance. It would fix intellectual attainments, next to religion, in the highest class. Thus money would sink in importance as a pursuit, or be valued only as it was the means of comfort to those who had it, or of communicating comfort to others. Knowledge also would be useful in taking off to a certain degree the corruptive effects of this spirit; for it would prevent it, by the more liberal notions it would introduce, from leaving the whole of its dregs of pollution upon the mind.

---

* I by no means intend to insinuate, that we ought to overlook the acts of Divine Providence, but that we ought not promiscuously to attribute everything to his particular interference, without a prior exercise of our reason.

The Quakers, again, as we have seen, have been charged with a want of animation; from whence an unjust inference has been drawn of the coldness of their hearts. But knowledge would diminish this appearance. For, in the first place, it would enlarge the powers and vary the topics of conversation. It would enliven the speaker. It would give him animation in discourse. Animation, again, would produce a greater appearance of energy, and energy of the warmth of life, and there are few people, whatever might be the outward cold appearance of the person, with whom they conversed, whose prejudices would not die away, if they found a cheerful and an agreeable companion.

Another charge against the members of this Society was obstinacy. This was shown to be unjust. The trait in this case should rather have been put down as virtue. Knowledge, however, would even operate here as a partial remedy. For, while they are esteemed deficient in literature, their opposition to the customs of the world will always be characterized as folly. But if they were to bear in the minds of their countrymen a different estimation as to intellectual attainments, the trait might be spoken of under another name. For persons are not apt to impute obstinacy to the actions of those, however singular, whom they believe to have paid a due attention to the cultivation of their minds.

It is not necessary to bring to recollection the other traits that were mentioned, to see the operation of a superior education upon these. It must have already appeared, that, whatever may be the general advantages of learning, they would be more than usually valuable to the Quaker-character.

CHAPTER VI.

Arguments of those of the Society examined, who may depreciate human knowledge—this depreciation did not originate with the first members—with Barclay—Penn—Ellwood—but arose afterwards—Reputed disadvantages of a classical education—its Heathen mythology and morality—Disadvantages of a philosophical one—its scepticism—general disadvantages of human learning—inefficiency of all the arguments advanced.

Having shown the advantages, which generally accompany a superior education, I shall exhibit the disadvantages, which may be thought to attend it; or I shall consider those arguments which some persons of this Society, who have unfortunately depreciated

human learning, though with the best intentions, might use against it, if they were to see the contents of the preceding chapter.

But before I do this, I shall exonerate the primitive members from the charge of such a depreciation. These exhibited in their own persons the practicability of the union of knowledge and virtue. While they were eminent for their learning, they were distinguished for the piety of their lives. They were, indeed, the friends of both. They did not patronize the one to the prejudice and expulsion of the other*.

Barclay, in his celebrated Apology, no where condemns the propriety or usefulness of human learning, or denies it to be promotive of the temporal comforts of man. He says that the knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, or of Logic and Philosophy, or of Ethics, or of Physics and Metaphysics, is not necessary. But not necessary for what? Mark his own meaning. Not necessary to make a minister of the Gospel. But where does he say that knowledge, which he himself possessed to such a considerable extent, was not necessary; or that it did not contribute to the innocent pleasures of life? What would have been the character of his own book, or what would have been its comparative value and usefulness, if he had not been able to quote so many authors to his purpose in their original texts, or to have detected so many classical errors, or to have introduced such apposite history, or to have drawn up his propositions with so much logical and mathematical clearness and precision; or if he had not been among the first literary characters of his day?

William Penn was equally celebrated with Barclay as a scholar. His works afford abundant proof of his erudition, or of the high cultivation of his mind. Like the rest of his associates, he was no advocate for learning as a qualification for a minister of the Gospel; but he was yet a friend to it on the principle that it enlarged the understanding, and that it added to the innocent pleasures of the mind. He entreated his wife, in the beautiful letter that he left her before he embarked on his first voyage to America, "not to be sparing of expense in procuring learning for his children; for that by such parsimony all was lost that was saved." And he recommended also, in the same letter, the mathematical and philosophical education, which I have described.

Thomas Ellwood, a celebrated writer among the early Quakers,

* George Fox was certainly an exception to this as a scholar. He was also not friendly to classical learning, on account of some of the indelicate passages contained in the classical authors, which he, and Furley, and Stubbs, took some pains to cite; but if these had been removed, I believe his objections would have ceased.

and the friend of the great John Milton, was so sensible of the disadvantages arising from a want of knowledge, that he revived his learning with great industry even after he had become a Quaker. Let us hear the account which he gives of himself in his own Journal. "I mentioned before," says he, "that when I was a boy I made some progress in learning, and that I lost it all again before I came to be a man. Nor was I rightly sensible of my loss therein, till I came amongst the Quakers. But there I both saw my loss and lamented it, and applied myself with the utmost diligence at all leisure times to recover it. So false I found that charge to be, which in those times was cast as a reproach upon the Quakers, that they despised and decried all human learning, because they denied it to be essentially necessary to a Gospel-ministry, which was one of the controversies of those times.

"But though I toiled hard, and spared no pains to regain what I had once been master of, yet I found it a matter of so great difficulty that I was ready to say, as the noble eunuch to Philip in another case, 'How can I, unless I had some man to guide me?'

"This I had formerly complained of to my especial friend Isaac Pennington, but now more earnestly; which put him upon considering and contriving a means for my assistance.

"He had an intimate acquaintance with Dr. Paget, a physician of note in London; and he with John Milton, a gentleman of great note for learning throughout the learned world for the accurate pieces he had written on various subjects and occasions.

"This person, having filled a public station in the former times, lived now a private and retired life in London; and, having wholly lost his sight, kept always a man to read to him, which usually was the son of some gentleman of his acquaintance, whom in kindness he took to improve in his learning.

"Thus, by the mediation of my friend Isaac Pennington with Dr. Paget, and of Dr. Paget with John Milton, was I admitted to come to him, not as a servant to him, (which at that time he needed not,) nor to be in the house with him, but only to have the liberty of coming to his house at certain hours when I would, and to read to him what books he should appoint me; which was all the favor I desired."

By means of this extract made from the Life of Thomas Ellwood, we come to three conclusions: First, that among the early Quakers there were many of considerable learning. Secondly, that these did not decry or depreciate human knowledge. And, thirdly, that the calumny of such a depreciation by them arose from the controversy,

which they thought it right to maintain, in which they denied it to be necessary as a qualification for a Gospel-minister.

This latter conclusion brings me round again to the point. And here I must observe, that though this famous controversy occasioned the first members to be unduly blamed on account of such a depreciation, yet it contributed to make some of their immediate successors, as I stated in a former volume, justly chargeable with it. But whether this was or was not the real cause, it is not material to the question. Many of the Society, from some cause or other, did undoubtedly, in the age immediately succeeding that of their founders, begin to depreciate human knowledge; the effects of which, though gradually dissipating, have not been wholly done away at the present day. The disadvantages, therefore, of human learning, or the arguments which would be advanced against it by those who may undervalue it, I shall now consider.

These arguments may be divided into particular and general. On the former I shall first speak.

A classical education is considered to be objectionable, first, on account of the Heathen mythology, that is necessarily connected with it. Its tendency, as it relates to fabulous occurrences, is thought to be unfavorable, as it may lead to a romantic propensity, and a turn for fiction. But surely I may observe in answer to this, that the meaning of such occurrences cannot be well mistaken. If they are represented to our view in fable, they have had their foundation in truth. Many of them, again, are of such importance, that we could not wish to see them annihilated. Let us refer, for example, to the story of Deucalion and Pyrrha. Is it not one among the many outward confirmations of the truth of the history of Moses? Or do we not trace in it additional proofs of the deluge, and of the renewal of mankind?

Its tendency, again, as it relates to the fabulous history of the Heathen gods, their number, their offices, and their character, is considered as degrading and exceptionable. I will concede this for a moment. But may it not, on the other hand, be rendered instructive and useful? May not the retention of such a history be accompanied with great moral advantages to our children? The emperor Theodosius commanded the idol-temples to be destroyed. Instead of devoting them to the use of the Christians of those times, by which they might have been preserved to future generations, the most beautiful remains of antiquity were reduced to ruins. But would it not have been better, had Theodosius brought good out of evil, by retaining them? Would it not have been a high moral gratification to those, who knew the fact, that temples appropriated to the wor-

ship of idols, had been devoted to the service of the only true God? Would it not have been a matter of joy to these to have reflected upon the improving condition of mankind? And while they looked up to these beautiful structures of art, might not the sight of them have contributed to the incitement of their virtue? If it be the tendency of the corrupt part of our nature to render innocent things vicious, it is, on the other hand, in the essence of our nature to render vicious things in process of time innocent; so that the very remnants of idolatry may be made subservient to our moral improvement. "If," as I observed in the first volume, "we were to find an altar, which had been sacred to Moloch, but which had been turned into a stepping-stone to help the aged and infirm upon their horses, why should we destroy it? Might it not be made useful to our morality, as far as it could be made to excite sorrow for the past and gratitude for the present?" And in the same manner the retention of the Heathen mythology might be made serviceable. Ought it not, whenever we contemplate it, to make us thankful, that we have not the dark and cheerless path of our ancestors to tread;—that we have clearer light;—that we have surer prospects;—that we have a steadier ground of hope;—and ought we not on a contemplation of these superior advantages, brought to us by Revelation, to be roused into the practice of a superior virtue?

Classical education again, is considered as objectionable by the Society on account of the Heathen notions, which it may spread. Thus, for example, the highest reputation of man is placed in deeds of martial achievement, and a martial ardor is in consequence infused into youth, which it is difficult to suppress. That such effects are produced there can be no doubt; but how are we to avoid these whilst we are obliged to live in the world? The expulsion of the classics from the system of our education would not expel such notions. Our own newspapers, which are open to all, spread the same opinions, and are instrumental of course in producing the same excitements; but they do it in a much more objectionable way than the classical authors; that is, they do it with less delicacy, and with a more sanguinary applause. But where, as I observed before, shall we retire from such impressions? Does not the recruiting drum propagate them in all our towns? Do not the ringing of the bells, and the illuminations, which occasionally take place in the time of war, propagate them also? And do we not find these, both in war and in peace, the sentiments and impressions of the world? Our own notions, then, our own writings, and our own customs, are more to be blamed in this respect than the literary compositions of antient times. But this, of all others, ought to be least an objection with

the members of this Society to such an education, because, to their honor, they have a constant counteraction of the effects of such sentiments and impressions in the principles of their own constitution; and which counteraction can not cease, while by the bearing of their testimony they live in a continual protest against them.

The last objection to a classical education is, that the system of the Heathen morality is generally too deficient for those, who are to be brought up as Christians. To this I answer, that it is quite as good as the system of the morality of the world. I could procure purer sentiments, and this generally, from the Heathen authors, usually called classical*, than I can collect from many even of the admired publications of our own times The morality of the Heathens is not so deficient as many have imagined. If their best opinions were duly selected and brought into one view, the only matter of surprise would be, how, with no other than the law written upon the heart, they had made such sublime discoveries. It was principally in their theology, where the law written upon the heart could not reach, that the antients were deficient. They knew but little of the one true God. They did not know hat he was a Spirit, and that he was to be worshipped in spirit and in truth. They were ignorant of his attributes. They had learned nothing of the true origin, nature, and condition of man, or of the scheme of creation and redemption. These things were undoubtedly hidden from the eyes of the antient philosophers: and it was in knowledge of this kind chiefly that their deficiency was apparent. But how is this particular deficiency detrimental to youth, or how, rather, might it not be rendered useful to them in the way described? What a sublime contrast does knowledge, as exhibited by Revelation, afford to the ignorance of those times; and what joy and gratitude ought we not to feel in the comparison! And this is the only use, which can be made of their mythology. For, when we send youth to the classical authors, we send them to learn the languages, and this through a medium where the morality is both useful and respectable; but we do not send them, living where the blessings of Revelation are enjoyed, to be instructed in religion.

---

* It must, however, be acknowledged, that amidst beautiful sentiments such as are indelicate are occasionally interspersed. But the Quakers might remedy this objection by procuring a new edition of the purest Classics only, in which particular passages might be omitted. They might also add new Latin notes, founded on Christian principles, where any ideas were found to be incorrect, and thus make Heathenism itself useful, as a literal teacher of a religious system. The world, I believe, would be obliged to the Quakers for such an edition; and it would soon obtain in most of the schools of the kingdom.

The principal argument against a philosophical education, which is the next subject for consideration, is, that men, who cultivate such studies, require often more proofs of things than can always be had: and that if these are wanting they suspend their belief. And as this is true in philosophy, so it may be true in religion. Hence, persons accustomed to such pursuits are likely to become sceptics or infidels. To this I answer, that the general tendency of philosophy is favorable to religion. Its natural tendency is to give the mind grand and sublime ideas, and to produce in it a belief of the existence of one great Cause, which is not visible among men. Thus, for example, I find that the planets perform a certain round. They perform it with a certain velocity. They do not wander at random, but they are kept to their orbits. I find the forces, which act upon them for this purpose. I find, in short, that they are subject to certain laws. Now if the planets were living agents, they might have prescribed these laws to themselves. But I know that this, when I believe them to consist of material substances, is impossible. If, then, as material substances, they are subject to laws, such laws must have been given them. There must have been some lawgiver. In this manner, then, I am led to some other great, and powerful, and invisible agent or cause. And here it may be observed, that if philosophers were ever baffled in their attempts after knowledge, as they frequently are, they would not on this account have any doubt with respect to the being of a God. If they had found, after repeated discoveries, that the ideas acquired from thence were repeatedly or progressively sublime, and that they led repeatedly or progressively to a belief of the existence of a Superior Power, is it likely that they would all at once discard this belief, because their researches were unsuccessful? If they were to do this, they would do it against all the rules of philosophizing, and against the force of their own habits. I say that analogical is a part of philosophical reasoning, and that they would rather argue, that as such effects had been uniformly produced, so they would probably still be produced, if their researches were crowned with success. The tendency, then, of philosophical knowledge is far otherwise than has been supposed. And it makes highly in favor of the study of these sciences, that those, who have cultivated them the most, such as Newton, and Boyle, and others, have been found among the ablest advocates of religion*.

I come now to the general arguments used by the Quakers against human learning; the first of which is, that they, who possess it, are

* I by no means intend to say that Philosophy leads to the religion called Christianity, but that it does to Theism, which is the foundation of it.

too apt to reduce religion to reason, and to strip it of the influence of the Spirit. But this is contrary, as a general position, to all fact. We find no mention of this in history. The Fathers of the Church were the most eminent for learning in their own days; and these insisted upon the influence of the Spirit in spiritual concerns, as one of the first articles of their faith. The Reformers, who succeeded these, were men of extensive erudition, and acknowledged the same great Principle. And nine-tenths, I believe, of the Christians of the present day, among whom we ought to reckon nine-tenths of the men of learning, also adopt a similar creed.

Another general argument is, that learning is apt to lead to conceit and pride, or to a presumed superiority of intellect; in consequence of which men raise themselves in their own estimation, and look down upon others as creatures of an inferior order or race. To this I may answer, that, as prodigies are daily produced in nature, though they may be but as one to a hundred-thousand when compared with the perfect things of their own kind, so such phænomena may occasionally make their appearance in the world. But, as far as my own experience and observation extend, I believe the true tendency of learning to be quite the reverse. I believe the most learned to be generally the most humble, and to be the most sensible of their own ignorance. Men in the course of their studies daily find something new. Every thing new shows them only their former ignorance, and how much there is yet to learn. The more they persevere in their researches, the more they acknowledge the latter fact. The longer they live, the more they lament the shortness of life, during which, man with all his industry can attain so little; and that, when he is but just beginning to know, he is cut off. They see, in short, their own nothingness; and, however they may be superior in their attainments, they are convinced that their knowledge is, after all, but a shadow;—that it is but darkness;—that it is but the absence of light—and that it no sooner begins to assume an appearance, than it is gone.

The last general argument against learning is, that it does not lead to morality, or that learned men do not always exhibit an example of the best character. In answer to this I must observe, that the natural tendency of learning is to virtue. If learned men are not virtuous, I presume their conduct is an exception to the general effect of knowledge upon the mind. That there are, however, persons of such unnatural character I must confess. But any deficiency in their example is not to be attributed to their learning. It is to be set down, on the other hand, to the morally defective education they have received. They have not been accustomed to wise restraints. More

pains have been taken to give them knowledge, than to instruct them in religion. But where an education has been bestowed upon persons, in which their morals have been duly attended to, where has knowledge been found to be at variance, or, rather, where has it not been found to be in union with virtue? Of this union the Quakers can trace some of the brightest examples in their own Society. Where did knowledge, for instance, separate herself from religion in Barclay, or in Penn, or in Burroughs, or in Pennington, or in Ellwood, or in Arscott, or in Claridge, or in many others, who might be named? And as this has been the case in the Quaker-Society, where a due care has been taken of morals, so it has been the case where a similar care has been manifested in the great society of the world.

——"Piety has found
Friends in the friends of science, and true pray'r
Has flow'd from lips wet with Castalian dews.
Such was thy wisdom, Newton, childlike sage!
Sagacious reader of the works of God,
And in his word sagacious. Such, too, thine,
Milton, whose genius had angelic wings,
And fed on manna. And such thine, in whom
Our British Themis gloried with just cause,
Immortal Hale, for deep discernment prais'd
And sound integrity not more, than fam'd
For sanctity of manners undefil'd." COWPER.

It appears, then, if I have reasoned properly, that the arguments usually adduced against the acquisition of human knowledge are but of little weight. If I have reasoned falsely upon this subject, so have the early Quakers. As the most eminent among them were friends to virtue, so they were friends to science. If they have at any time put a low estimate upon the latter, it has been only as a qualification for a minister of the Gospel. Here they have made a stand. Here they have made a discrimination. But I believe it will no where be found that they have denied either that learning might contribute to the innocent pleasures of life, or that it might be made a subordinate and auxiliary instrument in the promotion of virtue

CHAPTER VII.

Conclusion of the work—conclusory remarks divided into two kinds—first as they relate to those, who may have had thoughts of leaving the Society—advantages which these may have proposed to themselves by such a change—these advantages either religious or temporal—the value of them considered.

Having now gone through all the subjects, which I had prescribed to myself at the beginning of this work, I purpose to close it. But as it should be the wish of every author to render his production as useful as he can, I shall add a few observations for this purpose. My remarks then, which will be thus conclusory, will relate to two different sorts of persons. They will relate first to those, who may have had thoughts of leaving the Society, or, which is the same thing, who persist in a course of irregularities, knowing beforehand, and not regretting it, that they shall be eventually disowned. It will relate, secondly, to all other persons, or to those, who may be called the world. To the former I shall confine my attention in this chapter.

I have often heard persons of great respectability, and these even in the higher circles of life, express a wish that they had been brought up as Quakers. The steady and quiet deportment of the members of this Society, the ease with which they appear to get through life, the simplicity and morality of their character, were the causes, which produced the expression of such a wish. "But why then, I have observed, if you feel such a disposition as this wish indicates, do you not solicit membership? Because, it has been replied, we are too old to be singular. Dressing with sufficient simplicity ourselves, we see no good reason for adopting the dress of the Society. It would be as foolish in us to change the color and fashion of our clothing, as it would be criminal in its members, with their notions, to come to the use of that, which belongs to us. Endeavoring also to be chaste in our conversation, we see no reason to adopt their language. It would be as inconsistent in us to speak after the manner of the Quakers, as it would be inconsistent in them to leave their own language for ours. But still we wish we had been born Quakers. And, if we had been born in the Society, we would never have deserted it.

Perhaps they, to whom I shall confine my remarks in this chapter, are not aware that such sentiments as these are floating in the minds of many. They are not aware, that it is considered as one of the strangest things for those, who have been born in the Society and been accustomed to its peculiarities, to leave it. And least of all are they aware of the worthless motives, which the world attributes to them for an intended separation from it.

There is, indeed, something seemingly irreconcilable in the thought of such a dereliction or change. To leave the society of a moral people, can it be a matter of any credit? To diminish the number of those, who protest against war, and who have none of the guilt upon their heads of the sanguinary progress of human destruction which is going on in the world, is it desirable, or rather ought it not to be a matter of regret? And to leave it at a time when its difficulties are over, is it a proof of a wise and a prudent choice? If persons had ever had it in contemplation to leave the Society in its most difficult and trying times, or in the days of its persecution, when only for the adoption of innocent singularities its members were insulted, and beaten, and bruised, and put in danger of their lives, it had been no matter of surprise; but to leave it when all prejudices against them are gradually decreasing; when they are rising in respectability in the eyes of the government under which they live; and when, by the weight of their own usefulness and character, they are growing in the esteem of the world, is surely a matter of wonder, and for which it is difficult to account.

This brings me to the point in question, or to the examination of those arguments, which may at times have come into the heads of those, who have had thoughts of ceasing to be members of this Society.

In endeavoring to discover these, we can only suppose them to be actuated by one motive, for no other will be reasonable, namely, that they shall derive advantages from the change. Now all advantages are resolvable into two kinds; into such as are religious, and into such as are temporal. The first question then is, what advantage do they gain in the former case? or do they actually come into the possession of a better religion.

I am aware that to enter into this subject, though but briefly, is an odious task. But I shall abstain from all comparisons, by which I might offend any. If I were to be asked which among the many systems of the Christian religon I should prefer, I would say, that I see in all of them much to admire, but that no one of them perhaps does wholly, or in every part of it, please me; that is, there is no one, in which I do not see some little difficulty, which I can not solve, though this is no impediment to my faith. But if I were pressed more particularly upon this point, I would give the following answer: I would say that I should prefer that, which, first of all, would solve the greatest number of difficulties, as far as scriptural texts were concerned, in conformity with the divine attributes; which, secondly, would afford the most encouraging and consolatory creed, if it were equally well founded with any other; and which, thirdly, either by

its own operation, or by the administration of it, would produce the most perfect Christian character. Let us then judge of the religion of the Society by this standard.

That there are difficulties with respect to texts of Scripture must be admitted; for, if all men were to understand them alike, there would be but one profession of the Christian religion. One man endeavors to make his system comport wholly with human reason; and the consequence is, that texts constantly stare him in the face, which militate against it. Another discards reason, with a determination to abide literally by that which is revealed: and the consequence is, that, in his literal interpretation of some passages, he leaves others wholly irreconcilable with his scheme. Now the religion of the Society has been explained, and this extensively. In its doctrinal parts it is simple:—it is spiritual. It unites generally philosophy with revelation. It explains a great number of the difficult texts with clearness and consistency. That it explains all of them, I will not aver. But those, which it does explain, it explains in the strictest harmony with the love, goodness, justice, mercy, and wisdom of God.

As to the creed of the Society, we have seen its effects. We have seen it to be both encouraging and consolatory. We have seen it produce happiness in life and courage in death. The doctrine of the possibility of human perfection, where it is believed, must be a perpetual stimulous to virtue. It must encourage hope and banish fear. But it may be said, that, stimulative and consolatory as it may be, it wants one of the marks which I have insisted upon, namely, a sound foundation. But surely they, who deny it, will have as many scriptural texts against them as they who acknowledge it; and will they not be rendering their own spiritual situation perilous? for, what do the Quakers mean by perfection? Not the perfection of God, to which there are no limits, as has been before explained, but that which arises to man from the possibility of keeping the divine commands. They mean that perfection, such as Noah, and Job, and Zacharias, and Elizabeth attained, and which the Jewish rabbies distinguished by the name of redemption, and which they conceived to be effected by the influence of the Holy Spirit; or that state of man in Christian morals, which, if he arrives at it, the Divine Being (outward redemption having taken place by the sacrifice of Christ) is pleased to accept as sufficient, or as the most pure state at which man, under the disadvantages of the frailty of his nature, can arrive. And is not this the practicable perfection, which Jesus himself taught in these words, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect?" Not that he supposed it possible that any human being

could be as perfect as the divine nature. But he proposed by these expressions the highest conceivable model of human excellence, of which our natures were capable, well knowing that, the higher our aspirations, the higher we should ascend, and the sooner we should ascend, and the sooner we should reach that best state of humanity that was attainable. And here it is that Christianity, as a rule of moral conduct, surpasses all others. Men in general look up to men for models. Thus Homer makes one of his heroes, when giving counsel to his son, say, "Always emulate the best." Thus also we should say to our children, if a person of extraordinary character were to live in our neighborhood, "This is the pattern for your virtue." But Jesus Christ says, Aim at perfection beyond that which is human, alluding to the attributes of God, and thus you will attain a higher excellence than the study of any other model can produce.

With respect to the formation of man according to the model which Christianity prescribes, the system of the Quakers is no where to be excelled. No one, that we know of, is more powerful in the production of a subjugated mind and of a moral character. By this I mean, that there is none, which is more generally powerful. It is the tendency of Christianity, whatever denomination it may assume, to produce these effects. But there is full as general an appearance of these among the Quakers, as in any other Christian profession.

It will appear, then, that if the three criterions, which have been specified, should be admitted to be those, by which a judgment may be formed in the present case, they, who have had thoughts of leaving the Society, will not be much better off by an exchange of their religion.

Let us see next what would be the greater temporal advantages, which they would obtain. These may be summed up in two essential ingredients of happiness: in tranquility of mind, in consequence of which we pass through the troubles of life in the most placid manner; and in a moderate pecuniary independence, in consequence of which we know none of the wants and hardships, but enjoy the reasonable comforts, of existence.

With respect to tranquility of mind, we have shown this to be habitual with the Quakers. It arises from their domestic enjoyments, from seldom placing their pleasures or their fortunes in the power of others, from freedom from the ambition and envyings of the world, from the regulation of the temper, from avoiding quarrels and law-suits, and from other causes. And with respect to a moderate pecuniary independence, we have shown not only that this is the general portion of the Society, but that it is the very nature of their habits to acquire it. Now these essential ingredients of hap-

piness, or these temporal advantages, do not belong to the present members only. They have always belonged to members, and they will be perpetuated as an inheritance to their children, as long as Quakerism lasts. By this I mean to say, that, if any Quakers now living could be sure that their descendants would keep to the wholesome regulations of the Society for ten generations to come, they might have the comfort of believing that tranquility of mind would accompany them, as an effect of the laws and constitution belonging to it, and that at any rate an easy pecuniary situation in life would be preserved to them. For, if it be no difficult thing, with the natural habits of this Society, to acquire an independence, it is much easier to preserve that which has been left to them. But will they, who have had it in contemplation to leave the Society, be able to say this for their children, when they adopt the world for their home? What certainty is there that these will experience tranquility, unless they are seen, quite as far as manhood, in the habits of religion? Will the cares of the world, its ambition, its thirst after honors, and its unbridled affections and passions, give them no uneasiness? And can the fortunes transmitted to them, subject as they will be to its destructive fashions and pleasures, be ensured to them for even half of their times? How many have we seen, who have been in the prime of health in the day-time, who have fallen before night in the duel! And how many have we seen in a state of affluence at night, who have been ruined by gaming in the morning!

But it is possible, that they, who may have had thoughts of leaving the Society, may picture to themselves another advantage, which I have not yet mentioned. It is possible that there may be yet one, which they may distinguish by such a name. They may possibly think it to be a gain to get rid of the restraint of the discipline of the Society, and to enjoy the freedom of the world.

That the discipline is a restraint I do not deny. But it must never be forgotten, that its object is moral good, and its effect the preservation of a moral character. But come, you, who complain of this heavy burthen imposed upon you, let us converse together for a moment, and let us see, if, when you relinquish it, you do not impose upon yourself a worse. Are you sure that, when you get rid of this discipline, you will not come under the discipline of Fashion? And who is Fashion? Is she not of all mistresses the most imperious, and unreasonable, and cruel? You may be pleased with her for a while, but you will eventually feel her chains. With her iron whip, brandished over your head, she will issue out her commands, and you must obey them. She will drive you without mercy through all her corruptive customs, and through all her chameleon changes,

and this against your judgment and against your will. Do you keep an equipage? You must alter the very shape of your carriage, if she prescribes it. Is the livery of your postillion plain? You must make it of many colors as she dictates. If you yourself wear corbeau or raven-color to-day, you must change it, if she orders you, to that of puce or the flea to-morrow. But it is not only in your equipage and dress that she will put you under her control. She will make you obedient to her in your address and manners. She will force upon you rules for your intercourse with others. She will point out to you her amusements, and make you follow them. She will place you under her cruel laws of honor, from which if you swerve, she will disown you. Now I beseech you tell me, which you think you would prefer, the discipline of the goddess Fashion, or that of the good old mistress which you may have wished to leave? The one kindly points out to you, and invites and warns you to avoid, every dangerous precipice, that may be before you. The other is often not satisfied but with your destruction. She will force you, for a single word uttered in a thoughtless moment, to run the hazard of your life, or to lose what she calls your character. The one, by preserving you in innocence, preserves you happy. The greater your obedience to her, the greater is your freedom; and it is the best species of freedom, because it is freedom from the pollutions of the world. The other awakens your conscience, and calls out its stings. The more obedient you are to her, the greater is your slavery; and it is the worst species of slavery, because it is often slavery to vice. In consequence of the freedom, which the one bestows upon you, you are made capable of enjoying nature, and its various beauties, and, by the contemplation of these, of partaking of an endless feast. In consequence of the slavery, to which the other reduces you, you are cramped as to such enjoyments. By accustoming you to be pleased with ridiculous and corruptive objects, and silly and corruptive changes, she confines your relish to worthless things. She palsies your vision, and she corrupts your taste. You see nature before you, and you can take no pleasure in it. Thus she unfits you for the most rational of the enjoyments of the world, in which you are designed to live.

CHAPTER VIII.

Conclusory remarks, as they relate to those, who compose the world at large—Advantages which these may derive from the contents of this work—from a review of many of the customs and of the principles explained in it—from seeing practically the influence of these customs and principles in the production of character and happiness—and from seeing the manner of their operation, or how they produce the effects described.

I SHALL now endeavor to make my conclusory remarks useful, as they may relate to those, who may be called the world.

To state the object, which I have in view, I shall observe at once, that men are divided in opinion as to the lawfulness, or expediency, or wholesomeness, of many of the customs, fashions, and accomplishments of the world. Thus we find some encouraging in their families, and this without any hesitation and to an almost unlimited extent, those which many, on account of religious considerations, have expelled. Thus we find others endeavoring to steer a course between the practice of these. The same diversity of sentiment prevails also with respect to principles. The virtuous or moral are adopted by some. The political by others. That the political often obtain both in education and in subsequent life, there is no question. Thus, for example, a young man is thought by some to be more likely to make his way in the world with the address, which fashionable accomplishments may give him, even if he be a little dissipated, than one of strict virtue with unpolished manners. Thus, again, in actions and transactions, policy is often preferred to express and open declarations of the truth. Others, again, are of opinion that the general basis of principle should be virtue, but that a latitude may be allowed for a seasonable policy. Thus an education is going on under Christian parents, as if Christianity had objects in view, which were totally opposite to each other.

It is chiefly in throwing light upon subjects, such as the foregoing, that I can hope to be useful in this conclusory part of my work. We have seen, in the course of it, both customs and principles laid open and explained. We have seen these examined by a moral standard. We have seen their tendencies and bearings. We have seen their influence on character and happiness. We have seen the manner in which they act, or how this influence is produced. A revision therefore of these customs and principles cannot but be useful, but more particularly to parents, as it may enable some, in conjunction with the knowledge they possess, to form probably a more correct system, than they may have had it in contemplation to adopt for the education of their youth.

The first advantage, then, which those, who compose the world at large, may derive from the contents of this work, will be from a review of some of the customs, which have been censured in it.

In looking into customs, the first that obtrudes itself upon our notice is that of allowing to children those amusements, which, on account of the use of them, may be called Gaming. A view is offered us here which is divested of all superstition. It is no where contended, in speaking against these, that their origin is objectionable. It is no where insisted upon, that there is evil in them considered abstractedly by themselves, or that they may not be used innocently, or that they may not be made the occasion of innocent mirth. The evil is shown to arise from their abuse. The nature of this evil is unfolded. Thus the malevolent passions, such as anger, envy, hatred, revenge, and even avarice, are stirred up, where they should be particularly prevented—in the youthful breast. A spirit of gaming, which may be destructive of fortune, health, and morals, is engendered. A waste of time is occasioned*, inasmuch as other pursuits might be followed, which would be equally amusing, but conducive to the improvement of the mind. The nature of the abuse is unfolded likewise. It consists of making games of chance productive of loss and gain. Thus they hold up speedy pecuniary acquisitions, and speedy repairs of misfortunes. Thus they excite hope and fear, and give birth to pain and disappointment. The prevention also of the abuse, and that alone, which can be effectual, is pointed out. This consists of a separation of emoluments from chance, or of the adoption of the maxim, that no youth ought to be permitted to lay a wager, or to reap advantage from any doubtful event by a previous agreement on a moneyed stake. Now, if the reader be not disposed to go the length which the Society does, by the abolition of such amusements, he will at least have had the advantage of seeing that there may be evil in them, and where it lies, and the extent (if he will only look at the historical instances cited) to which it may proceed, and its infallible prevention or its cure.

The next subject, among customs, which offers itself to our view is the practice of Music; and this comes before us in two forms, either as it is instrumental or vocal.

With respect to instrumental, it is no where insisted upon that its origin is evil, or that it is not productive of a natural delight, or that

*This argument is usually applied to grown persons; but may be applied to youth, when we consider the ingenious inventions of modern times, such as maps of dissected geography, historical and other games; which, while they afford pleasure, promote improvement.

it does not soothe and tranquilize the passions, or that it may not be innocently used, or that it may not be made under limitations a cheerful companion in solitude. But it is urged against it, that it does not tend, like many other studies, to the improvement of the mind; that it affords no solid ground of comfort, either in solitude or affliction; that it is a sensual gratification; and that sensual gratifications, if indulged in leisure hours, take up the time, which should be devoted to those of a higher nature, that is, intellectual and moral pursuits. It is urged against it, again, that, if abused, it is chargeable with a criminal waste of time, and a criminal impairing of health; that this abuse, in consequence of proficiency being insisted upon, (without which it ceases to be delightful) is at the present day almost inseparable from its use; and that where the abuse of a thing, either in consequence of fashion, or its own seductive nature, or any other cause, is either necessarily or very generally connected with the use of it, watchfulness to avoid it is as much a duty in Christian morals, as it is a duty against the common dangers of life.

On vocal, again, we observe a proper distinction made. We find that the singing is no more criminal than the reading of a song, being but another mode of expressing it, and that the morality of it therefore will depend upon the words and sentiments it contains. If these are indelicate, or unchaste, or hold out false and corruptive ideas, as has been shown to be the case with a variety of songs, then singing may from an innocent become a vicious amusement. But it has been observed, that youth seldom make any discrimination or selection with respect to songs; but that they pick up all that come in their way, whatever may be the impropriety of the words or sentiments which they may contain.

Now if the reader, whether we speak of instrumental or vocal music, should not be willing to discard this science as the Quakers do, he will at least have learned some good from the observations, which the work will have held out to him on this subject. He will see that evil may unquestionably be produced by the cultivation of it. He will see the absolute necessity of guarding his children against the learning of it to professional precision, as it is now unfortunately taught, to the detriment of their health, and of the acquisition, on account of the waste of time which it occasions, of more important knowledge. He will see also the necessity of great vigilance with respect to the purity of the words and sentiments, which may be connected with it.

The important custom, which is brought next before us, is that of attendance at the Theatre. Here we are taught, that, though dramatic pieces had no censurable origin, the best of the antient moral-

ists condemned them. We are taught, that even in the most favorable light, in which we can view them, they have been thought objectionable; that is, that, where they have pretended to teach morality, they have inculcated rather the virtue of heathenism, than the strict, though mild, morality of the Gospel; and where they have attempted to extirpate vice, they have done it rather by making it appear ridiculous, than by teaching men to avoid it as evil, or for the love of virtue. We are taught that, as it is our duty to love our neighbor and to be solicitous for his spiritual welfare, we ought not, under a system which requires simplicity and truth, to encourage him to be what he is not, or to personate a character which is not his own. We are taught, that it is the general tendency of the diversions of the stage, by holding out false morals and prospects, to weaken the sinews of morality; by disqualifying for domestic enjoyments, to wean from a love of home; by accustoming to light thoughts and violent excitements of the passions, to unfit for the pleasures of religion. We are taught that diversions of this nature particularly fascinate; and that, if they fascinate, they suggest repetitions. And, finally, we are taught that the early Christians on their conversion, though before this time they had followed them as among the desirable pleasures of their lives, relinquished them on the principles now explained.

The next custom, which comes to us in order, is Dancing. This is handed down to us under two appearances; either as it is simple, or as it is connected with preparations and accompaniments.

In viewing it in its simple state, it is no where contended, if it be encouraged on the principle of promoting such an harmonious carriage of the body or use of the limbs as may be promotive of health, that it is objectionable, though it is supposed that it is not necessary for such purposes, and that without music and its other usual accompaniments it would not be pleasant. Neither is it contended that a simple dance upon the green, if it were to arise suddenly and without its usual preparations, may not be innocent, or that it may not be classed with an innocent game at play, or with innocent exercise in the fields; though it is considered that it would hardly be worthy of those of riper years, because they, who are acknowledged to have come to the stature of men, are expected to abandon amusements for pursuits of usefulness, and particularly where they make any profession of the Christian name.

In viewing it with its preparations, and with its subsequent accompaniments, as usually displayed in the ball-room, we see it in a less favorable light. We see it productive, where it is habitually resorted to, of a frivolous levity, of vanity and pride, and of a little-

ness of mind and character. We see it also frequently becoming the occasion of the excitement of the malevolent passions, such as anger, envy, hatred, jealousy, malice, and revenge. We find it also frequently leading to indisposition*. We find, lastly, that in consequence of the vexation of mind, which may arise from a variety of causes, but more particularly from disappointment, and the ascendancy of some of the passions that have been mentioned, more pleasure is generally perceived in the anticipation of these amusements, than in the actual taste or use of them.

The custom of reading Novels is presented next to our view. And here it is shown, that no objection can be truly adduced against these on account of the fictitious nature of their contents. Novels, also, are not all of them promiscuously condemned. It is contended, however, from a variety of causes which were shown, that they are very generally censurable. We are taught, again, that the direct tendency of those, which are censurable, is to produce conceit and affectation, a romantic spirit, and a perverted morality, among youth. We are taught, again, that on account of the peculiar construction of these, inasmuch as they have plot and character like dramatic compositions, they fascinate, and this is to such a degree, that youth wait for no selection, but devour promiscuously all that come in their way. Hence the conclusion is, that the efforts alleged against novels can not but be generally produced. We are presented also with this fact, that, on account of the high seasoning and strong stimulants they contain, all other writings, however useful, become insipid. Hence the novel-reader, by becoming indisposed to the perusal of more valuable books, excludes himself from the opportunity of moral improvement; and, if immoral sentiments are contracted, from the chance of any artificial corrective of these.

The Diversions of the Field offer themselves as the next custom to our notice. We are taught on the discussion, which has arisen on this subject, that we are not permitted to take away the lives of animals wantonly, but only as their bodies may be useful for food, or as they may be dangerous to ourselves, and to the other animals which may belong to us; and that a condition is annexed to the original grant or charter, by which permission was given to kill, which is never to be dispensed with; or, in other words, that we are to take away their lives as speedily as we can. Hence rights have sprung up on the part of animals, and duties on the part of men, any breach

* Not only colds, head-aches, and a general lassitude, are the next day the result of dancing in ball-rooms, but occasionally serious indisposition. I have known the death of two young persons attributed to it by the physicians who attended them in their illness.

of which is the violation of a moral law. Hence the diversions of the field become often objectionable, because life is not thus taken away as speedily as it might otherwise have been, and because food or noxiousness is not often the object of the destruction of animals, but mere pleasure or sport. We are taught also to consider animals, not as mere machines, but as the creatures of God. We are taught also, that, as they were designed to have their proper share of happiness during the time of their existence, any wanton interruption of this is an invasion of their rights as living beings. And we are taught, finally, that, the organic nature of men and animals being the same as far as a feeling of pain is concerned, the sympathy which belongs to our nature, and the Divine law of doing as we would be done by, which will hold as far as we can enter into the perceptions either of men or brutes, impose upon us the duty of anticipating their feelings, and of treating them in a correspoding or tender manner.

If we take a view of other customs, into which the Society has thought it right to introduce regulations with a view of keeping its members pure and innocent, we learn other lessons of usefulness. Thus, for example, the reader, if he does not choose to adopt their custom of dressing, may obtain desirable knowledge upon this subject. He will see that the two great objects of dress are decency and comfort. He will see, though Christianity prescribes neither color nor shape for the clothing, that it is not indifferent about it. It enjoins simplicity and plainness, because where men pay an undue attention to the exterior they are in danger of injuring the dignity of their minds. It discards ornaments from the use of apparel, because these, by puffing up the creature, may be productive of vanity and pride. It forbids all unreasonable changes on the plea of conformity with fashion, because the following of fashion begets a worldly spirit: and because, in proportion as men indulge this spirit, they are found to follow the loose and changeable morality of the world, instead of the strict and steady morality of the Gospel.

On the custom of Language, though the reader may be unwilling to adopt all the singularities of the members of this Society, he may collect a lesson that may be useful to him in life. He may discover the necessity of abstaining from all expressions of flattery, because the use of these may be morally injurious to himself by abridging the independence of his mind, and by promoting superstition; while it may be injurious to others by occasioning them to think more highly of themselves than they ought and more degradingly of their fellow-creatures. He may discover also the necessity of adhering to the truth in all expressions, whether in his conversation or in his letters;

that there is always a consistency in truth, and an inconsistency in falsehood; that, as expressions accord with the essences, qualities, properties, and characters of things, they are more or less proper; and that an attempt to adhere to the truth is productive of moral good; while a departure from it may lead into error, independently of its injury as a moral evil.

With respect to the custom of Address, or of the complimentary gestures or ceremonies of the world, if he be not inclined to reject these totally, as the Quakers do, he may find that there may unquestionably be evil in them, if they are to be adjudged by the purity of the Christian system. He may perceive that there may be as much flattery, and as great a violation of truth, through the medium of the body as through the medium of the tongue; and that the same mental degradation, or loss of dignified independence of mind, may insensibly follow.

On the custom of Conversation and Manners, he may learn the propriety of caution as to the use of idle words—of abstaining from scandal and detraction—of withholding his assent to customs when started, however fashionable, if immoral—of making himself useful by the dignity of the topic he introduces, and by the decorum with which he handles it—of never allowing his sprightliness to border upon folly, or his wit upon lewdness, but to clothe all his remarks in an innocent and a simple manner.

From Customs connected with Meals, such as that, for example, of saying Grace, he may learn that this is a devotional act; that it is not to be said as a mere ceremony, by thanking the Supreme Being in so many words while the thoughts are roving on other subjects; but that it should be said with seriousness and feeling, and that it should never come as an oblation from the tongue, except it come also as an oblation from the heart. And on that, which relates to the Drinking of Toasts, he may see the moral necessity of an immediate extirpation of it. He may see that this custom has not one useful or laudable end in view; that it is a direct imitation of Pagans in the worst way in which we can follow them—their enjoyment of sensual pleasures; and that it leads directly and almost inevitably to drunkenness, and of course to the degradation of the rational and moral character.

Having now shown the first advantage, or that, which they who compose the world may derive from a review of many of the customs which have been treated of in the work, I shall state the second advantage, or that, which may be afforded them from a review of the principles contained in it.—The advantage in question will principally consist in this,—in knowing what kind of principles and peo-

ple, confessedly moral, have adopted as their own, and this after serious deliberation, and on a religious ground. It is of great importance from whence principles come recommended to our notice. If they come from the inconsiderate and worthless, they lose their value. If from the sober and religious, we receive them under the impression that they may be promotive of our good. I shall therefore give a summary of these, as they may be collected from the work.

"God has imparted to men a portion of his own Spirit, though he has given it to them in different degrees. Without this Spirit it would be impossible for them to discern spiritual things. Without this, it would be impossible for them to know, spiritually, even that the Scriptures were of Divine authority, or spiritually to understand them. This Spirit performs its office of a Teacher by internal monitions, and, if encouraged, even by the external objects of creation. It is also a primary and infallible Guide. It is given to all without exception. It is given to all sufficiently. They, who resist it, quench it, and this to their own condemnation. They, who encourage it, receive it more abundantly, and are in the way of salvation or redemption. This Spirit, therefore, becomes a Redeemer also. Redemption, however, may be considered in two points of view; either as it is by outward or inward means, or as it relates to past sins or to sins to come. Jesus Christ effected redemption of the first kind, or that from past sins, while he was personally upon earth, by the sacrifice of himself. But it is this Spirit, or Christ within, as the Quakers call it, which effects the latter, or which preserves from future transgressions. It is this which leads, by means of its inward workings, to a new birth, and, finally, to the highest perfection of which our nature is capable. In this office of an inward Redeemer it visits all, so that all may be saved, if they will attend to its saving operations; God being not willing that any should perish, but that all should inherit eternal life.

"This Spirit also qualifies men for the ministry. It qualifies women also for this office, as well as men. It dictates the true season for silence, and the true season for utterance, both in public and private worship.

"Jesus Christ was man, because he took flesh, and inhabited the body which had been prepared for him; but he was Divinity, because he was the Word.

"A resurrection will be effected, but not of the body as it is. Rewards and punishments will follow, but guilt will not be imputed to men till they have actually committed sin.

"Baptism and the Lord's Supper are essentials of the Christian re-

ligion. They are not, however, essentials as outward ordinances, but only as they are administered by the Holy Spirit.

"Civil Government is for the protection of virtue, and for the removal of vice. Obedience should be paid to all its laws, where the conscience is not violated in doing it. To defraud it in any manner of its revenues, or to take up arms under any consideration against it, is unlawful. But if men cannot conscientiously submit to any one or more of its ordinances, they are not to temporize, but to obey Jesus Christ rather than their own governors in this particular case. They are, however, to be willing to submit to all the penalties, which the latter may inflict upon them for so doing. And as no Christian ought to temporize in the case of any laws enjoined him by the Government under which he lives, so neither ought he to do it in the case of any of the customs or fashions, which may be enjoined him by the world.

"All Civil Oaths are forbidden in Christianity. The word of every Christian should be equivalent to his oath.

"It is not lawful to return evil for evil, nor to shed the blood of man. All wars, therefore, are forbidden.

"It is more honorable, and more consistent with the genius and spirit of Christianity, and the practice of Christ and of his Apostles, and of the primitive Christians, that men should preach the Gospel freely, than that they should live by it, as by a profession or by a trade.

"All men are brethren by creation. Christianity makes no difference, in this respect, between Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, bond and free. No geographical boundaries, nor color of the skin or person, nor difference of religious sentiment, can dissolve this relationship between them.

"All men are born equal with respect to privileges. But as they fall into different situations and ranks of life, they become distinguished. In Christianity, however, there is no respect of persons, or no distinction of them but by their virtue. Nobility and riches can never confer worth, nor can poverty screen from a just appropriation of disgrace.

"Man is a temple, in which the Divinity may reside. He is therefore to be looked upon and treated with due respect. No Christian ought to lower his dignity, or to suffer him, if he can help it, to become the instrument of his own degradation.

"Man is a being, for whose spiritual welfare every Christian should be solicitous, and a creature, therefore, worthy of all the pains that can be bestowed upon him for the preservation of his moral character.

"The first object in the education of man should be the proper subjugation of his will.

"No man ought to be persecuted, or evil spoken of, for a difference in religious opinion; nor is detraction or slander allowable in any case.

"Every religious community should consider the poor belonging to it as members of the same family, for whose wants and comforts it is a duty to provide. The education also of the children of these should be provided for.

"It is enjoined us to live in peace with all men. All quarrels, therefore, are to be avoided between man and man. But if differences arise, they are to be adjusted by arbitration, and not, except it be otherwise impossible, by going to law; and never by violence.

"If men offend against the laws, they should be prevented from doing injuries in future, but never by the punishment of the loss of life. The reformation of a criminal, which includes a prevention of a repetition of such injuries, is the great object to be regarded in the jurisprudence of Christians.

"In political matters, there is no safe reasoning but upon principle. No man is to do evil that good may come. The policy of the Gospel is never to be deserted, whatever may be the policy of the world.

"Trade is an employment, by means of which we are permitted to gain a livelihood. But all trades are not lawful. Men are responsible, as Christians, for engaging in those which are immoral, or for continuing in those which they may carry on either to the moral detriment of themselves or of others. Abstinence from hazardous enterprises, by the failure of which innocent persons might be injured, and honesty in dealing, and punctuality to words and engagements, are essentials in the prosecution of trade."

Having made observations on the customs, and brought to the view of the reader some of the prominent principles, of the members of this Society, I come to the third advantage, or to that, which will arise from knowing the kind of character which these in conjunction will produce.

On this subject we might be permitted our conjectures. We might insist upon the nature and immediate tendencies of these customs and principles, and we might draw our conclusions from thence; or we might state how these were likely to operate in the production of character, so as probably not to be far from the truth. But we are spared both the trouble of such a task, and are relieved from the fear of having the accuracy of our conclusions doubted. The character of the Quakers has been made up from the acknowledgements

of others. It has been shown that they are a moral people; that they are sober, and inoffensive, and quiet; that they are benevolent to man in his religious and temporal capacity; that they are kind or tender-hearted to animals; that they do not make sacrifices of their consciences to others; that in political affairs they reason upon principle; that they are punctual to their words and engagements; and that they have independence of mind, and courage. Their character, as it is defective, has been explained also. It has been probed, and tried by a proper touchstone. Appearances have been separated from realities. The result has been, that a deficiency in literature and science, and that superstition, and that an undue eagerness after money, have been fixed upon a portion of them. The two former, however, it is to be recollected, are only intellectually defective traits, and may be remedied by knowledge. The latter, it is to be presumed, belongs rather to individuals than to the Society at large. But, whatever drawbacks may be made from the perfect by the imperfect qualities that have been stated, there is a great preponderancy on the side of virtue. And where, when we consider the evil propensities of our nature, and the difficulty of keeping these in due order, are we to look for a fairer character? That men, as individuals, both Quakers and others, may be of a more perfect character than that we have just given of the Society, is not to be doubted. But where shall we find them purer as a body? And where shall we find a faulty charrcter where the remedy is more easily at hand?

The next advantage will be in seeing the manner of the operation of these customs and principles, or how they act. To go over every trait in the character of the Society with this view, would be both tedious and unnecessary. I shall therefore only select one or two of these for my purpose. And, first, How do these customs and principles produce the trait of benevolence? I reply thus: The Quakers, in consequence of their prohibitions against all public amusements, have never seen man in the capacity of a hired buffoon or mimic, or as a purchasable plaything. Hence they have never viewed him in a low and degrading light. In consequence of their tenet on war, they have never viewed him as an enemy. In consequence of their disciplinary principles, they have viewed him as an equal. Hence it appears that they have no prejudices against him from causes, which often weigh with others, either on account of rank, or station, or many of the customs of the world. Now, I conceive that the dereliction of prejudice against man is equally necessary, as a first measure, to the production of benevolence towards him, as the dereliction of vice to the production of virtue. We see, then, their minds free from bias on this subject. But what is there on the other side

to operate actively towards the promotion of this trait? They view man, in the first place, as a temple, in which the Divinity may reside. This procures him respect. Secondly, as a being for whose spiritual welfare they ought to be solicitous. This produces a concern for him. And, thirdly, as a brother. This produces relationship. We see, then, the ground cleared. We see all noxious weeds extirpated. We see good seeds sown in their places: that is, we see prejudices removed from the heart; and we see the ideas of respect, concern, and relationship implanted in it. Now it is impossible that these ideas, under these circumstances, should not as naturally and immediately produce a general benevolence to man, as common seeds, when all obstructive weeds are removed, produce their corresponding saplings or flowers.

How, again, are these customs and principles of the Quakers promotive of the beautiful feature of independence of mind? I answer thus:—There is a natural independence of mind in man, but it is often broken and weakened. Some men injure it by the solicitation and acceptance of honors, and pensions, and places: others, by flattery and falsehood: others, by customs of obeisance: others, by their obedience to fashion. But the independence of mind of the members of this Society is not stunted in its growth by the chilling blasts of such circumstances and habits. It is invigorated, on the other hand, by their own laws. No servility is allowed either in word or gesture. Neither that which is written, nor that which is uttered, is to please the vanity of the persons addressed, or to imply services never intended to be performed. The knee is not to be bent to any one. This trait is strengthened, again, and made to shoot by their own maxims. It is possible for persons to be in the habit of viewing all men as equal in privileges, and no one as superior to another but by his virtue, and not to feel a disposition that must support it? Can the maxim of never doing evil that good may come, when called into exercise, do otherwise than cherish it? And can reasoning upon principle have any other effect than that of being promotive of its growth?

These, then, are the ways, in which these customs and principles operate. Now, the advantage to be derived from seeing this manner of their operation consists in this: First, that we know, to a certainty, that they act towards the production of virtue. Knowing, again, what these customs and principles are, we know those which we are bound to cherish. We find also that there are various springs, which act upon the moral constitution for the formation of character. We find some of these great and powerful, and others inferior. This consideration should teach us not to despise even those which are

the least, if they have but a tendency to promote our purity. For, if the effect of any of them be only small, a number of effects of little causes or springs, when added together, may be as considerable as a large one. Of these, again, we observe, that some are to be found where many would hardly have expected them. This consideration should make us careful to look into all our customs and principles, that we may not overlook any one, which we may retain for our moral good. And as we learn the lesson of becoming vigilant to discover every good spring, and not to neglect the least of these, however subtle its operations; so we learn the necessity of vigilance to detect every spring or cause, and this even the least, whether in our customs or our principles, if it should in its tendency be promotive of vice.

And in the same manner we may argue with respect to what may be other productions of these customs and principles of the Quakers. For, as we have seen the latter lead to character, so we have seen them lead to happiness. The manner of their operation to this end has been also equally discernible. As we value them because they produce the one, so we should value them because they produce the other. We have seen also which of them to value. And we should be studious to cherish the very least of these, as we should be careful to discard the least of those, which are productive of real and merited unhappiness of the mind.

And now, having expended my observations on the tendencies of the customs and principles of the members of this Society, I shall conclude by expressing a wish that the work, which I have written, may be useful. I have a wish that it may be useful to those who may be called the world, by giving them an insight into many excellent institutions, of which they were before ignorant, but which may be worthy of their support and patronage. I have a wish also that it may be useful to the Quakers themselves: first, by letting them see how their own character may be yet improved; and, secondly, by preserving them, in some measure, both from unbecoming remarks, and from harsh usage, on the part of their fellow-citizens of a different denomination from themselves. For surely when it is known, as I hope it is by this time, that they have moral and religious grounds for their particularities, we shall no longer hear their scruples branded with the name of follies and obstinacies, or see magistrates treating them with a needless severity*, but giving them, on the

* Some magistrates, much to their honor, treat them with tenderness; and no people are more forward than the Quakers in acknowledging any attention that may be shown them, but particularly where their religious scruples are concerned.

other hand, all the indulgences they can, consistently with the execution of the laws. In proportion as this utility is produced, my design will be answered in the production of the work, and I shall receive pleasure in having written it. And this pleasure will be subject only to one drawback, which will unavoidably arise in the present case; for I can not but regret that I have not had more time to bestow upon it, or that some other person has not appeared, who, possessing an equal knowledge of the Society with myself, but better qualified in other respects, might have employed his talents more to the advantage of the subjects, upon which I have treated in this volume.